

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Educational studies in the Scottish Universities : 1870-1970

Thesis

How to cite:

Bell, Robert Elliott (1986). Educational studies in the Scottish Universities : 1870-1970. PhD thesis The Open University.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 1986 The Author

Version: Version of Record

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk



DX 73833 /87

UNRESTRICTED

Educational Studies in the Scottish Universities 1870-1970

**by Robert Elliott Bell,
MA (Cambridge), MA (Dublin), MEd (Edinburgh)**

**A thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Open University**

June 1986

**School of Education
Centre for Human Learning & Development**

Authors Number : HDF 5131
Date of Submission : 24.6.86
Date of Award : 2.10.86

Robert Elliott BELL

Educational Studies in the Scottish Universities 1870-1970

In 1876, after an enthusiastic campaign by the main teachers' organisation, Edinburgh and St. Andrews became the first English-speaking universities in the world to establish permanent chairs of Education. Half a century later Scotland became the first country in the British Isles to demand university graduation of all male and secondary teachers in the public sector, except for those involved in art, crafts and physical education. Yet by the 1970s the Education Departments in the Scottish Universities were considerably smaller than in most English universities and, indeed, St. Andrews had abandoned the study of Education altogether.

The thesis suggests that the primary reason for this course of events lay in the persistent refusal of the Scottish Education Department, except for a few years at the turn of the century, to allow the universities any role in the professional, as opposed to the general higher education of teachers.

With the training role denied them, the universities had thus to seek other tasks in the field of Educational Studies, notably the teaching of a post-graduate honours degree, unique within Britain, the old Scottish Bachelor of

Education. Established at the end of the first world war, this degree was also recognised as a professional qualification by the British Psychological Society and during the next fifty years it not only provided a major stimulus to the professional development of school-teachers, training college lecturers and educational administrators but also became a key factor in the development of mental testing and of the educational psychology service throughout the United Kingdom.

The final chapters of the thesis explore the nature and teaching of this degree along with the eventual career patterns of graduates. This exploration is based on the hitherto unpublished findings of a questionnaire survey and series of interviews carried out by the author during the late 1960s.

"An absolute uniformity prevails from John O'Groats to Maidenkirk. It is safe to say that not a single educational experiment is being tried throughout the secondary schools of the country. All have their rigid and uniform courses and within these limits excellent work is undoubtedly being done. But unless the strangle grip of the (Scottish Education) Department is removed, higher education will assuredly become more lifeless, more mechanical and more unsatisfying year by year."

School World January 1915

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Introduction: the Aim and the Approaches	1
Chapter 1 The Drudge at the Academic Hearth	15
Chapter 2 Founding the Scottish Chairs	59
Chapter 3 Laurie and Meiklejohn	110
Chapter 4 The Provincial Committees	184
Chapter 5 Establishing the Degree	229
Chapter 6 The Degree and After	277
Chapter 7 After the Second War	335
Chapter 8 The Scottish Education Degree	379
Chapter 9 The Degree and the Education Professors	422
Appendix A An Investigation of the Old Scottish Education Degree	462
Appendix B The Questionnaire	469
Bibliography	482

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Author wishes to thank in particular the Scottish Council for Research in Education and its then Director, Dr David Walker, for their early encouragement and partial financing of the data collection for this study. He also wishes to thank the staff of the Godfrey Thomson Unit for Educational Research and the Centre for Educational Sociology in the University of Edinburgh without whose help it could never have been completed. He is also grateful for the help of the staff of the Libraries and Archives of the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh, the Library of the Open University, the British Library, the Scottish Record Office, the National Library of Scotland, the British Psychological Society, the Educational Institute of Scotland, the General Teaching Council for Scotland, the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland and Moray House College. He certainly could not have managed without the cooperation of the many respondents and interviewees who took part in his investigation of the old Scottish Education Degree but in addition he remembers with gratitude the help in the early stages of his work of Professors John and Stanley Nisbet, Dr Albert Pilliner, Mr Richard Hamilton, the late Dr Marjorie Cruickshank and Dr John Butcher. Later, he also received valuable advice from Dr John Bynner and Dr Robert Anderson. But above all, he is grateful to Caroline Clark for her extremely efficient and constructively helpful typing of the thesis, and to Marjatta Bell and Andrew McPherson for keeping his nose to the final grindstone.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

ADE	Association of Directors of Education in Scotland
BJEP	British Journal of Educational Psychology
BJES	British Journal of Educational Studies
BJP	British Journal of Psychology
BPS	British Psychological Society
CCE	Committee of Council in Education
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
EIS	Educational Institute of Scotland
GC	General Council
MHT	Moray House Test(s)
NFER	National Foundation for Educational Research
NLS	National Library of Scotland
NC	Normal College
NS	Normal School
SCRE	Scottish Council for Research in Education
SEA	Secondary Education Association
SED	Scottish Education Department
SEJ	Scottish Educational Journal
SRO	Scottish Record Office
TC	Training College/Training Centre
UGC	University Grants Committee

INTRODUCTION: THE AIM AND THE APPROACHES

One striking difference in recent years between the eight Scottish universities on the one hand and universities elsewhere in Europe and the English-speaking world on the other, has lain in their attitude to Education as an academic subject. While other universities may not always have shown it much respect and may have accorded it both low academic and low social status, they have nevertheless allowed it considerable houseroom and the supply of Education chairs has expanded enormously, especially since the Second World War. In Scotland, however, the situation has been quite different. Three of the universities (St. Andrews, Strathclyde and Heriot-Watt) have no Education Department at all while in a fourth (Dundee) it has shrunk to such small proportions that it is about to be swallowed up by a new department with largely different functions. In three of the others (Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen) though there is a Chair and a Department, the professional training of school teachers, is never undertaken and has for eighty years been forbidden by government.¹ Only in the smallest and youngest of the universities, Stirling, is there a Department on English lines, having more than one chair and performing the functions considered normal outside Scotland and even its role as a teacher training establishment was only grudgingly allowed "as an experiment" by the new General Teaching Council in the expansive atmosphere of the mid-1960s.

Yet, markedly, Edinburgh and St. Andrews were, as early as 1876, the first English-speaking universities in the world to establish Education chairs and between 1914 and 1918 all four of the Scottish universities then in existence established a post-graduate degree in Education that was to have a considerable influence on the development of psychology and teacher-training not only in Scotland but throughout the United Kingdom. During the first half of the twentieth century those same universities were to house some of the leading figures in British educational thinking and research – notably Adams, Boyd, Thomson, Rusk, Drever and Vernon – and to help to give birth as early as 1928 to the first national research body in Britain, the

Scottish Council for Research in Education. In addition they have had a healthy supply of post-graduate students also guaranteed by the fact that all male and secondary teachers in Scotland (other than those in art, physical education and crafts) have since 1924, by a decision of government, been without exception university graduates.

Commenting on this 1924 decision in a 1962 survey of British teacher training, H.C. Dent felt that "there could be no better illustration of Scotland's traditional respect for academic scholarship".² Yet in fact it is now clear that such respect could never be guaranteed for the university study of Education itself. By 1962 the number of candidates seeking the once highly prestigious Edinburgh post-graduate degree in Education had shrunk to 2 and by the end of that decade, both the Edinburgh chair and its one other distinctive commitment - to an academic Diploma for those concurrently undergoing training in a nearby college - were to be threatened with abolition at a time when Educational Studies in most English and Welsh universities were booming.

The aim of this work is to explore how such things could be and why the chairs founded in 1876 failed to fulfil the expectations of their founders. No doubt from the beginning they were the object of some academic prejudice, especially when they failed to live up to their original financial promise, though such prejudice was never on the English scale and certainly was shown by only a minority of University colleagues during their first half century. Thus prejudice can never adequately explain their mid-twentieth century failure to keep pace with developments in England where prejudice was greater and their inability to dominate their local college sector in the English manner. A more substantial explanation is necessary.

Often, the crucial reasons for university decisions and changes of direction turn out to be financial ones and certainly, financial considerations, as we shall see, played a part both in the foundation of the Edinburgh and St. Andrews chairs and in their early difficulties, as well as in the failure of Glasgow and Aberdeen to establish similar

chairs of their own for over three quarters of a century. But such financial strains can hardly be blamed on government parsimony. Large-scale state grants to Scottish universities were commonplace long before the UGC made them so in England and a traditional academic such as Principal Donaldson of St. Andrews could actually rejoice in his status as head of a "state" rather than a privately endowed institution.³ Moreover, with the imposition of universal graduation on the male and secondary teaching profession, the state was to pay for and deliberately direct into the Arts faculties of the universities thousands of students who in England would have sought their general education in a church or local authority college. Peddie (1926) "safely asserts" from his position as Executive Officer of the National Committee for the Training of Teachers that at that time 60% of the men and 80% of the women students in the Faculties of Arts were prospective teachers and, in the Faculty of Sciences not less than 50%.

The Universities, indeed, had from the 1890s onwards a highly profitable connection with the schools system. Why then did this not benefit their Education Departments? The main hypothesis of this work is that the explanation lay in a sustained and deliberate policy on the part of a highly centralised government department, the Scottish Education Department, to keep the control of professional teacher training as opposed to general teacher education out of the universities' too independent hands. Just as the Inspectorate continued to run the main secondary school examinations until the 1960s rather than allowing them to be run by the universities as in England, so the Scottish Education Department (SED) kept a grip on the details of training in what since 1906 had been overtly and since 1872 covertly nationalised colleges. It will be argued that this policy not only denied the University Departments the large income to be derived from such training which provides university departments elsewhere with the staff and infrastructure needed for the expansion of other activities but also could sometimes damage their credibility as practical advisers to the teaching profession at large.⁴ Above all, it weakened their

position *vis a vis* a strong, rival and sometimes predatory college sector, to the defence and strengthening of which SED was permanently committed as a means of controlling the school curriculum as well as entry to the profession. Teacher graduation could in Scottish circumstances, provide general education more cheaply than colleges could provide it, but allowing universities to decide what happened in classrooms was quite another thing.

As a result of all this, such a standard descriptive work as that of Hunter,⁵ can, without obvious damage, omit all mention of the University Departments from its late twentieth century account of the Scottish education system - even from the chapter dealing with the training of the teachers themselves - while standard university histories such as those of Horn⁶ (Edinburgh) and Cant⁷ (St. Andrews) need accord the chairs and their distinguished occupants over a whole century hardly more than a sentence or two, let alone a paragraph.

Yet, though the role of the university chairs and departments in the structure of the educational system or in the general development of their own institutions may seem negligible, the frustration of being denied teacher training, the original purpose of the chairs, seems to have produced a displacement of effort, into other more constructive channels, notably into a highly successful post-graduate degree, the old Bachelor of Education, called in Edinburgh the BEd and, in Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews, EdB. This degree was to pioneer psychological study at an honours level in Scotland and to introduce a high-level generalist knowledge of theory to the college staffs of both Scotland and England. Certainly in their own view⁸ the development of this degree was the major positive achievement of the Departments and its active promotion was in itself a function of the crucial denial of teacher training, for it was only after the final refusal of a role to the universities in the teacher-training reorganisation of 1906-07, that Drever and Darroch in Edinburgh set about planning a new academic Diploma and Degree structure that was soon to be adopted also by all the other universities then in existence.

This new degree was strongly and consciously inspired by American models and helped to prompt not only in Scotland but more widely, educational movements of considerable significance: Child Guidance Clinics, Mental Testing and the professionalisation of psychology, educational administration and college teaching. Almost all of these movements are still considerably under-researched in Scotland, and indeed, elsewhere, and there was therefore throughout the compilation of this work a considerable temptation to stray down fascinating paths that must remain marginal to what is primarily intended as a history of the Departments themselves. It is primarily meant to be university history, an account of the nature and results of a government/university confrontation rather than a slice of the general history of Scottish education or of psychology or local administration during the century under review. Insofar as the departments are the scene of interactions between a number of movements these are touched upon but the fortunes of the University Chairs and Lectureships in Education are the main concern.

The exploration of these issues depends heavily on one particular group of sources still rarely used in the writing of general educational history and recently graphically described by Simpson in her study of the British PhD degree, namely, "university archives, ranging as they do, from the almost non-existent, through the boxroom piled high with barely labelled brown paper parcels, to the professionally organized".⁹ In Scotland, mercifully, the last category is becoming more common. Even so, the well ordered minute books of Court, Senatus and General Council are rarely backed up with well ordered files of supporting documents. Even in the early twentieth century many minutes were still provided only in manuscript with the secretary laboriously copying "letters received" and "replies sent".

Moreover, it has long been a commonplace of university history that such minutes like university calendars are at best bland and at worst deceptive. As Hinsdale noted as long ago as 1900, "College catalogs, (*sic*) like other official documents, do not always tell the truth, or at least, the whole truth",¹⁰ and as another American

university historian, Storr, puts it, "they often fail ... to suggest the agitation which may have preceded final decision on a course of action".¹¹ Skilful minute-taking or editing can itself be a form of political action, not least in universities, not merely concealing views unpopular with the hierarchy but simply omitting embarrassing information or the details of other meetings assumed to be well known to the participants. The pedantic painstaking records of one day or one official can be followed by the slapdash summaries of another. To make things worse, few university departments preserve their correspondence indefinitely or with care and as the use of photocopiers increases, the need to shed becomes more and more pressing. To keep everything would be an impossibility, quite apart from the fact that academics are, more than most people, aware of what historians and posterity could do with their less flattering relics and indeed many may well take positive steps to frustrate them. One key set of letters used in chapter 7 were found, with no indications of confidentiality, in a refuse skip. All the pre-1940 archive of the Scottish branch of the British Psychological Society, which could have been of great importance in two or three of these chapters, was, according to Semeonoff,¹² sent off as salvage during the war, while most other Scottish institutions, notably the Provincial Committees and the National Committee for the Training of Teachers, seem to have preserved little but printed minutes, conference summaries and financial reports.

Few relevant personal papers appear to have survived even in the carefully catalogued collections of the National Library of Scotland or of the four universities and while those that do remain such as the exceptionally useful autobiographical manuscript by Boyd in Glasgow University throw much light on the writers' personalities and educational views, they are only rarely concerned with the detailed business of the departments and their relations with government. Even the collections of the Scottish Record Office are limited in their coverage of such issues, except for the period during the second war when McClelland's special committee of the Advisory Council on Education was investigating in depth the future of the

teaching profession and its training.

So far as Scottish university history is concerned, relevant secondary sources are far from common¹³ and Education as a subject rarely figures prominently even in those volumes that have been cited. Much British university history still confines itself to the period before 1800 (over 90% of the contributions to the first five issues of the recent journal *History of Universities* are so confined) or to describing the general growth of endowments, buildings and curriculum in one particular institution. Within such a framework little space can be devoted to the detailed history of a small Department. In the 1959 edition of Cottle and Sherborne's portrait of Bristol University, for example, though they clearly recognise the importance of the work of the Education Department and Institute and double their treatment of them compared with the 1951 edition, this still only amounts to two pages¹⁴ and volumes or articles dealing solely with the work of a University Education Department are still rare.¹⁵ In any case there is a further difficulty; as Harris reminded a recent Michigan seminar, "the essential problem in preparation of a university history ... is to balance concern for the setting and activities of the institution - the institutional history - with concern for the scholarly experiences of the campus - the intellectual history".¹⁶ Few Scottish historians have dealt much with the latter, at least in post-1800 terms, though continental writers such as Isalo (1979) often confine themselves to it.

Morgan in his treatment of the "Makers" of Scottish education deals with not only the deeds but the ideas of certain key figures for this study, but his writing is, as in much university historiography, merely celebratory, even hagiographical, rather than critical and this is of course true of most relevant obituaries. The most celebrated historian of ideas in the nineteenth century Scottish university, Davie, in his highly controversial *Democratic Intellect*¹⁷ deals with Laurie, the first Edinburgh Professor of Education, sympathetically but in no more than an extended sentence and though more serious comment, especially of Darroch, appears in the recent major study by Anderson of turn of the century schools and universities in Scotland,¹⁸ the Professors

of Education are still for him of only marginal importance.

Ironically, given their history, they seem to be just as marginal even to the historians of Scottish teacher training, including Cruickshank (1970) and Scotland (1969a), both of whose writings are considerably less satisfactory in their coverage of the University Departments' role than in their coverage of the college sector, something that is true also of writers such as Tropp (1957) and Gosden (1972) in England and of Corrigan (1961) writing of the United Kingdom in general.

For the fullest discussion of the role that Universities can play in the development of Educational Studies, readers in English must largely turn to North America where such matters have been seen as far more central to society's general cultural and political development.¹⁹ For Lasch, for example, in his history of the New Radicalism,²⁰ it is an Education professor, Dewey, who is a key figure, attacked for what was seen as the fecklessness of his notions on community and their anti-democratic implications, while for Clayton and his colleagues²¹ Dewey becomes a central hero and a great scientific liberator of society in general. It is difficult to imagine any Scottish or even British figure generating such strong emotions among general historians.²² It was, however, no accident that the leading Scottish figures, Drever and Darroch, included Political Science in their own education in the style of Americans such as Cubberley.

Fortunately American works have considerable relevance to Scotland as there was a consciousness of education developments there from a very early period. George Combe's report of 1841 on his phrenological and educational journeys in America²³ did much to influence Pillans and the campaign for the Scottish chairs. From the 1880s onwards intercourse between Scotland and America became normal for educationists and thus general American histories of the university education movement cast a strong light on Scottish developments especially after 1900,²⁴ when Columbia Teachers College (which had tried to tempt Laurie away from Edinburgh)

became the chief model for those attempting to bridge the gap between the University and College sectors and most of the major Scottish figures spent some time there.²⁵ There was a student exchange between St. Andrews and Columbia as early as 1913²⁶ and even continental thought often reached Scotland via America, as well as the forms of the modern research degree system.

The Harvard Committee's comment on the graduate study of education in America²⁷ had no rival in Britain until the appearance of Simpson (1983) and, among British surveys of the study of the education, only Adamson (1930) and Jones (1924) proved as useful in the preparation of this study as their American counterparts, though there was considerable dependence on the British bibliographies of Powell (1966), Silver and Teague (1970), Berry (1973) and Craigie (1974).

One further set of Scottish sources that proved unexpectedly helpful was the student newspapers which, throughout the period under review, cast light not merely on the attitudes of students but also on those of leading academics who used to contribute far more articles to such publications than is the case today. Equally useful were the very full and often frank comments by the anonymous Scottish correspondents of the English educational press, some of them leading University figures, who felt able, perhaps, to express themselves more freely there than in more local journals. For the period covered by chapters 4 and 5, in particular, *School World* and the *Journal of Education* often provide more satisfactory coverage than the Scottish papers themselves. Apart from a French study of Laurie (Remacle, 1909) there are no full-length biographies of the leading figures involved and a request for papers for an English biography, also of Laurie, (*Times* 20 Dec 1909) seems to have led to nothing.

Autobiographies of the leading protagonists are also unfortunately rare with Thomson breaking off the narrative of his unfinished *Education of an Englishman* (1969) just as he arrives in Edinburgh. The fullest personal narratives are those of

Boyd, already mentioned, and of Drever *pere* who wrote two accounts²⁸ (not entirely complementary) of his development as an educationist and psychologist. However, by far the greatest amount of autobiographical material used in the study is drawn from an earlier (unpublished) survey by the present author of all traceable holders of the old Scottish education degree. This survey mainly took the form of an anonymous postal questionnaire (hence the letters BQ - Bell's Questionnaire, used as an easy reference to the study throughout) but it also involved a large number of interviews with both key university figures and selected graduates, many of whom supplemented their responses with more detailed correspondence. BQ is the subject of methodological discussion in Appendix A and is employed extensively in chapters 8 and 9. It must be emphasised, however, that its findings refer merely to those graduates who were traceable and responded and statements about them or quotations of their individual views must not be too glibly generalised to the whole body of graduates. As Storr says of too much recent University history, BQ "contains documentary material and bits of information unobtainable elsewhere, but (all this) may be based on reminiscence, hearsay or other unverifiable evidence (while) in several cases an understandable but nonetheless uncritical loyalty to particular men or institutions has distorted the truth."²⁹

A far bigger problem than the difficulty of relying on personal memories, which can at least be checked against those of other people in a responding population of over 500, has been the need not to wander too far into territory that is relevant to this study but not at the heart of it. Thus, more could certainly have been made of Laurie's educational views and the curriculum of the Departments generally, but it has been felt best to concentrate on the Departments' fates as institutions and to touch on curriculum merely to give some taste of the people involved and the academic range and status of their activities, an academic range and status, it is claimed here, that is determined as much by political as educational or intellectual considerations.

One intellectual problem that cannot be avoided, however, and has not been

solved in this present work concerns the changing use of terms. As Humes puts it,³⁰ "the desire to identify a manageable area of activity, regardless of the distortions and oversimplifications it occasions, is still very much in evidence". In particular, there is a problem occasioned by the ever-changing uses of the term "education" itself, not to mention "pedagogy" and "paideutics", all of them apparently used interchangeably in the 1870s. In his search for precision, Humes came upon Bain's somewhat unsatisfactory working definition of education as "the work of the schoolmaster" but Principal Grant of Edinburgh, did not use "education" at all in that context and regularly referred to the 1876 Chair as one in Paideutics³¹ and Keir³² has drawn attention to the psychologist Sully's tabulation of the various disciplines seen by late nineteenth century writers as properly belonging to Educational Studies. The approach to the Mind of the Child he subdivided as follows:

	Theory	Practice
General	Child Psychology	Child Management (including Education & Paedeutics)
Individual	Child Study (Paedology)	Child Guidance (Paedogogy)

Very often in this study both the author and those whom he quotes confuse these categories, if, indeed, they ever seemed valid to anyone but Sully himself. In the educational world of the late nineteenth century, "pedagogy" often became a "general" concept, even on occasions a synonym for "education" though, unlike Sully, Hinsdale, for one, seems to see pedagogy as "practice" and education as "theory"³³ while Pillans in the *Edinburgh Review*³⁴ speaks of "didactics" in a way that fits none of Sully's categories. No attempt is made here, therefore, to distinguish between such terms as it seemed to serve no useful purpose.

One further set of interchangeable terms is used for Scottish centres of non-University teacher-training. The earliest term was "normal school" which meant precisely that, but it never really went out of official use and common parlance even after the training system had become more sophisticated and it had been replaced by "normal college". In turn that also was replaced by "training centre" and "training college" and finally "college of education" but each of these terms was likely to survive in use for years or even decades alongside the new designation and no attempt therefore has been made to "regularise" the use of such terms because of the distortions that might be produced, especially as the use of an archaic term may well have had ideological significance for the user.

NOTES

1. There is, of course, no legal restraint on the provision of teacher training but teachers so trained could not be registered by the General Teaching Council and could not be employed in state schools. Ironically they could be, and are registered, if their training was in a non-Scottish university.
2. Dent (1962) p 15.
3. Anderson (1983) p 260 "The Scottish Universities," Donaldson declared, "have no wish to become independent of the State, or to be removed from the control of the State".
4. Though this could be overcome through the efforts of figures such as Laurie and Boyd, who were able to win the teachers' confidence through their personal approach and ability as speakers.
5. Hunter (1968).
6. Horn (1967).
7. Cant (1970).
8. See chapter 8 below.
9. Simpson (1983) p 2.
10. *Educational Review (New York)* Feb 1900.
11. Storr (1953) p 135.
12. In an interview with the author, who found that the Executive minutes of the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland were missing for the period May 1926 - Nov 1933.
13. Bone (1967) p 90, indeed, draws attention to the general thinness of the secondary sources available for the writing of Scottish educational history.
14. Cottle and Sherborne (1959) pp 99-100.
15. Tyson and Tuck (1971) on Newcastle and Thomas (1983) on the University of Wales are as a result exceptionally useful. Knox (1950b) gives a satisfactory outline history of the St. Andrews chair that is unique in Scotland.
16. *Notes and Abstracts in American and International Education* No 65 (1985) p 3.
17. Davie (1961) p 333.
18. Anderson (1983).
19. A representative title, for example, is Butts and Cr  min (1953) *A History of Education in American Culture* while the preface to

Avrich (1980), assumes that any account of education must place it in a general framework of artistic and political development (see also Bailyn (1963) p 125) though American works can still stumble into the purely celebratory in the style of Morgan; see, for example, Wesley (1957).

20. Lasch (1965) pp 158 ff.

21. Clayton (1960).

22. Boyd was the best known to the population at large through his involvement in unemployment relief and Labour politics, as well as in teacher trades-unionism, but his name is not in the index of Harvie's recent wide-ranging cultural and industrial survey of Scotland in the twentieth century (Harvie, 1981).

23. Combe (1841).

24. Rugg (1947) (1952), Cremin (1962) (1965), Hofstadter and Hardy (1952) Brubacher (1947) and Brubacher and Rudy (1968) have proved exceptionally useful.

25. Both Boyd and Thomson spent whole years there during their period as departmental heads.

26. *School World* Oct 1913.

27. Harvard Committee (1966).

28. Drever (1936) (1948).

29. Storr (1953) p 135.

30. Humes (1980) p 24.

31. Grant (1994) Vol ii, 150.

32. Keir (1952) in *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XXII Part 1.

33. Hinsdale (1900) p 105.

34. *Edinburgh Review* Jul 1834 p 501.

CHAPTER 1
THE DRUDGE AT THE ACADEMIC HEARTH¹

In November 1875 John Struthers, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Aberdeen was invited to open the winter session of the University Debating Society. In his address² he claimed that the universities of Scotland had "before them a great future, great in respect to increased numbers and greater still in respect to increased usefulness, for," he asked, "what higher or nobler aim can a university have than to be the teacher of the teachers of the nation?" And with that aspiration in view he placed at the head of his list of university priorities "the importance of having a professorship of the Theory and History of Education", thus making it clear that he saw the universities' task as being not merely the provision of a teacher's general education but also his general introduction to professional theory and skills. Within a year of his speech Scotland was, indeed, to have two such professors, though neither of them was to be in Aberdeen. They were in fact the first two such professors in any English-speaking university.

In the half-century which followed, university studies in Education were to develop throughout Britain, North America and Australasia at a pace that could never have been imagined at the time of Struthers' speech³ and in the course of the twentieth century, the English-speaking universities were to develop teacher education beyond the undergraduate stage on such a scale that scores of thousands of graduate students were also to be trained for positions of leadership, particularly in the USA and Canada.⁴

Indeed, few university subjects expanded at such a rapid rate⁵ and thus it might be assumed, gained such ready acceptance. Yet Conant, the President of Harvard, writing in 1963 of his own time as a professor of chemistry, recalled how at the very beginning of his career, he had become particularly aware of the hostility of most of his fellow academics to schools or faculties of education and how he himself had long

shared the view of a majority of the faculty of arts and science, "that there was no excuse for the existence of people who sought to teach others how to teach". Whenever any issues involving benefits for graduate students in education came before committees, he "automatically voted with those who looked with contempt on the school of education".⁶ Brubacher and Rudy note how the refusal of academic faculties to take pedagogy seriously had forced the establishment of normal schools outside the universities' walls in contrast to the well-established university training schools of the other professions.⁷ It was hardly surprising, therefore, to find Boris Ford, professor of education at Sussex, suggesting that the development of a similarly negative attitude to educational studies in the English universities made "an intriguing and also an odd story, whose history might well be worth studying in detail as a sociological phenomenon".⁸

"Theoretically," suggested Rugg of Columbia Teachers College, "in a democratic society, the teacher of teachers should prove to be a man whose resources match the penalties of leadership. In a dynamic society he is the chosen change agent, the clear guide for the culture-moulding process. Potentially, I say, he is one of the true creatives of the people. But actually, in our society, things have turned out otherwise. Instead of leading, he is following";⁹ and the celebrated Harvard report of 1966, on graduate studies in education, was prepared to admit that while most people in the developed world experienced schooling intimately and many had taken courses and even degrees in the subject, few had studied it in any serious way at all;¹⁰ and the expression of similar doubts about the efficacy and seriousness of the apparently well established world of university educational studies is by no means rare in the literature throughout the century under review, although there have been equally constant expressions of confidence that "the tide has at last turned".

Bailyn (1963) quotes an anonymous optimist, noting the "traditional low esteem of education", who nevertheless felt that "during the past ten years the opportunities for truly scientific work in education have been shown as never before..."¹¹ but Darroch,

the second Edinburgh professor, in his 1903 inaugural lecture also believed that "doubts ... once prevalent (had) been more or less removed" but, in his next paragraph, had to admit that there were still some who "would deny, or at least hesitate to admit, that the subject (of education) is on a footing of equality with the other and cognate philosophical disciplines",¹² and in both the 1920s and the 1960s there were to be threats to the continued existence of the two chairs founded in 1876.

Moreover such negative attitudes to educational studies were even to be found among professional teachers themselves and among otherwise enthusiastic recruits to teaching who perceived the academic study of such subjects as irrelevant. A keen young Scotsman joining the teaching force of Nova Scotia in 1930 observed that the Dalhousie university training course in Halifax was generally 'looked on as a joke, a year's rest between the work of university and school: a pretty faithful parallel to the attitudes in Scotland',¹³ and he apparently felt no disloyalty to his profession in saying this, despite the fact that that profession in Scotland had struggled long and hard to have such studies established in their universities.

Armytage in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Education in Sheffield in 1955 admitted that "for most Englishmen education is at best a boring subject, unless their own children are involved",¹⁴ and cited Peacock's Mr Macborrowdale in *Gryll Grange* - "the bore of all bores, talking about education, a subject with no beginning, middle or end,"¹⁵ while a few years later, Butterfield, the historian, writing of his days as an undergraduate in early twentieth century Cambridge, recalled that "there was one word that you soon learned not to use ... unless you were prepared to be considered a rank outsider, and that word was *education*".¹⁶

So far as England was concerned, such an attitude was attributed by Payne (the first holder of a permanent American education chair) to the intellectual state of that country. The English view of education in the 1870s was, he said, the "unanimity of the ignorant"¹⁷ though any English reluctance to explore the subject was hardly new.

In the previous century, Dr Johnson had conclusively declared that "Education is as well known and has long been as well known as ever it can be";¹⁸ while, eighty years later, Wavell, a general noted for his intellectual and poetic interests, could still record with some bitterness that his Black Watch son was transferring to the peace-time Army School of Education.¹⁹

Certainly such strength of feeling was widespread among academics throughout the century under review. In the mid-1930s a leading scholar took it upon himself to warn the Dean of the Harvard School of Education, when a merger between that School and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences was being planned, that "a shotgun would be needed to carry the wedding off," for, he claimed, many of his fellow professors believed that "the courses given by professors of education are worthless and that degrees granted are of very little value."²⁰ Indeed, Eliot, the President of Harvard who first allowed Educational Studies into the university had himself had to undergo a conversion, having hitherto felt "but slight interest or confidence in what is ordinarily called pedagogy".²¹ And in England 50 years later Scruton, a regular philosopher contributor to the *Times* was still speaking of education professors' "factitious expertise" and of their positively "baleful influence on general society", claiming that "once established, the practice of diseducating teachers could not be easily overthrown."²²

Even in those universities where colleagues were more tolerant or even mildly supportive, and even as late as the 1940s, Education tended to remain, said Fred Clarke, the distinguished head of the London Institute, "a mere side-show ... in no sense central among the activities of the institutions where it (was) carried on. Still less (was) it regarded as having any great national importance and the results of its research achieved only a very limited currency".²³

In most universities the education departments' work lay outside the main undergraduate programme so that its status was totally marginal so far as the general

discussions and financial arrangements of faculties and senates were concerned. As a result, Ford suggests, "assertions of poor quality gradually turned into fact." In most English and Welsh universities, he claimed, understaffed departments, providing little else than a one-year graduate training course "pursued very little research ... and carried staff many of whom seemed, by university standards, non-academic,"²⁴ recalling a common charge against American teacher-trainers that they were not just incompetent but positively 'anti-intellectual'²⁵ and supporting the common English Public School view, expressed by Simpson and others, that most education lecturers "had either been notoriously unsuccessful teachers themselves, or gave the impression they would not be too happy if confronted with flesh and blood in the class-room."²⁶

But whatever the personal skills and quality of education professors and lecturers the most powerful and persistent argument deployed against the training of teachers or the academic study of education was, first and foremost, the view that teachers are born and not made²⁷ and Payne, the first holder of the chair at the College of Preceptors made his first priority the scotching of the notion that effective teachers can be untrained 'quacks', operating entirely on intuition.²⁸ The second argument was that because the teacher's aim was practical, he wanted nothing but the practical'; so that the imparting or even the formulation of theory was useless or even dangerous and for this reason Findlay, the first professor at Manchester, greatly regretted the way in which (partly under Scottish influence) theoretical studies of education had remained grounded in traditional philosophy, thus feeding a popular notion that they *were* useless. Yet, he reminded his audience, such general philosophy, in the hands of Plato and Aristotle, had given birth to the eminently practical sciences of Law and Economics and he believed that the same authors' writings showed the way in which an academically respectable and yet practical science of Education could be developed.²⁹ And this also was the view of Lord Reay in his rectorial address at St. Andrews in 1885, in which he particularly emphasised the importance of theory in the

training of secondary teachers who were to spend the rest of their lives dealing in theories.³⁰ However the Canadian, Brehaut, visiting Britain eighty years later could still detect a widespread fear of academic educationists as 'faddists' and 'impractical Theoreticians',³¹ quoting Fred Clarke's finding that 'in England, as surely nowhere else, men looked upon as authorities in education found something irresistably comic about the idea ... of teaching people to teach', preferring them to teach 'by the light of Nature'.³² The argument of Laurie, the first Edinburgh Professor, that such objections could equally be made to Schools of Art simply fell on deaf ears.³³ In 1882 those opposing an education chair in the Mason Science College in Birmingham feared that as there had been no final agreement about principles, whatever the professor taught might be condemned by practising teachers, for he was likely to be a "theorist", not a practical man or experienced teacher,³⁴ and certainly the idea of specialist staff teaching the theory of school-teaching while not being practising teachers themselves was a constant theme of critics, even of those who favoured a greater degree of reflection on educational matters. Matthew Arnold, for one, felt that professional training divorced from the school would be 'a very curious thing with no real teaching in it ... nothing but talking about educational principles',³⁵ and this was a point readily taken by the first Scottish professors themselves who had to admit with regret that they had no demonstration schools or classes at their disposal.³⁶ Yet both Arnold and they at least agreed that some study of theory could *enhance* practice, a view still being denied, as Bantock noted, in the English newspapers of eighty years later.³⁷

Nor were such doubts expressed only about practical training as such. The doubts extended also to educational research. As theoretical and research work advanced, their practitioners became increasingly aware that however high the quality of their work, teachers as much as laymen constantly failed to take seriously or to see as relevant what were clearly valid and potentially useful academic findings and judgements. As Rusk, the Scottish pioneer of "experimental education" in Britain, put it with some bitterness, 'the complaint of the modern research worker ... against the

old-time teacher (was) not that he did not solve the problems of education, but that his self-complacency prevented him from seeing them.³⁸

Other enthusiasts for educational studies went further, lamenting the philistinism and lack of general reading that they felt characterised a teaching profession insensitive alike to philosophical speculation and scientific discovery. Laurie pitied the teacher who was "a mere mechanical method-monger, having no living source of method in himself, wanting therefore in elasticity, in confidence, in thought, in the liberty wherewith philosophy makes the teacher free".³⁹ Fitch, in the 1860s, confessed it was disheartening to find how few teachers seemed to 'be taking pains with their own mental activities. They have,' he said, 'more leisure than most persons and they often tell me what the occupations of their leisure are. Among these ... it is entirely rare to find that the pursuit of any kind of knowledge takes a place'⁴⁰ and fifty years later, Hendy was to speak of the 'indifference and ridicule' generally shown by the profession to speculation and training,⁴¹ and given such scepticism, it was not surprising that those wishing to be heard and those aspiring to academic posts in education should be ever more anxious to emphasise their practical experience and to play down their concern with theory and academic niceties.

Oscar Browning, fellow of King's and chief architect of what educational studies there were in nineteenth century Cambridge, introducing an academically respectable volume of essays on the Great Educators published in 1881, still felt the need to begin by emphasising that the volume was not merely 'accurate' but 'popular', that the main lines of the writers' thinking had been followed only 'so far as they are important at the present day' and that his 'chief qualification' for producing such a volume was not apparently his undoubted scholarship but that 'he had been for fifteen years a working schoolmaster'.⁴² Thus even good scholars, generally respected in the university world, had to be 'popular' in order to gain readers when writing on educational topics for a graduate and professional audience. It is difficult to believe that had Browning been writing on Plato's political rather than educational theory he would have had to

apologise for not being an MP or a retired civil servant and to have disguised the academic nature of his argument.

This demand for practical experience came to be built into the recruitment policies of education faculties even at such prestigious institutions as Columbia and Harvard, and often reinforced the view in university colleagues that the inhabitants of such departments must have had dubious academic credentials for them ever to have been content with earlier posts as mere school teachers in the first place and while such an inference of academic inferiority would not necessarily have been drawn in Britain where, in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, school and university career structures more readily overlapped, Public and Grammar School scorn for Theory and Training was in itself sufficiently great to cause a widespread feeling that practised schoolteachers, especially headmasters, rather than distinguished theoreticians or researchers, were the most suitable occupants of chairs of education.

Even Andrew Bell, part of whose legacy was eventually to finance the first two Scottish chairs stated on more than one occasion that it was only 'by attending the school, seeing what was going on there and taking a share in the office of tuition, that teachers are to be formed, and not by lectures and abstract instructions'⁴³ and such a belief would continue to be widespread even after a century of Bell professors had done their best to prove that a combination of practice and theory was likely to prove more effective.

These beliefs that teachers can be trained by practice alone, that good teachers are born and not made, and that teaching is an art rather than a science also underlay and did much to feed the prejudices of those academics who felt that the introduction of the study of teaching to the university implied some imperfection in their own untrained efforts, especially in the nineteenth century when the research role of university professors was not yet seen as necessarily superior to their teaching one. Conant felt that as a professor he felt confident that (he) was an excellent teacher and

had developed his skill by experience,⁴⁴ and was not alone in feeling patronised by professors of education.

Of course, any random collection of the generalised comments of sceptics and enemies, culled from the literature of a century or more, obviously has little validity as an adequate assessment of the real nature or worth of the academic study of education during the period. Even so it does provide evidence of a remarkably persistent negative stereotype, current not merely in English-speaking *academia* but in the school-teaching profession and public circles generally. Such a stereotype was noticeably absent in Germany where pedagogical studies were already well established in the universities by the beginning of the nineteenth century and in France where the Ecole Normale Supérieure had a high academic standing, though it was not unknown elsewhere in Northern Europe, in Sweden, for example, where educational studies did not appear in the prestigious university of Uppsala until the twentieth century.⁴⁵

Most remarkable of all, however, was the way in which the stereotype gained some vogue even among the teachers of teachers themselves, for while some were proud of their achievements – Bibby was to write in 1961 of 'educationists of high calibre', building up a 'corpus of pedagogical principles and theory which has given the study of education a quite new academic respectability'⁴⁶ and Tyson and Tuck were to speak ten years later of the 'systematic study' and 'breadth of outlook' underlying their colleagues' work in Newcastle⁴⁷ – such optimistic commentators are matched by others only too anxious to make excuses or at least to join in the admission of failure.

In 1964 Taylor, later head of the London Institute, joined Ford in acknowledging the 'low level of academic attainment and intellectual motivation' in English university departments of education,⁴⁸ while Morris, a Bristol professor of education, writing in 1972, claimed that the 'newness' of the subject in the universities (and this a whole

century after the first Scottish chairs) 'had been and still is an important factor in the lack of regard in which the university training of teachers is held'⁴⁹ though there were clearly many respectable academic subjects with a far shorter history. Brehaut, visiting Britain a year later, met, even more remarkably, not just excuses or regret for low academic standards, but even a proud mistrust of scientific criteria among teachers of teachers and encountered a body of researchers for whom 'scientifically scrupulous work was not enough', for whom intuitive knowledge of children was more important and, who could maintain that 'schools do not exist to provide material for higher degree theses',⁵⁰ a defensible view no doubt but one hardly likely to endear education departments to their faculty colleagues or to their more rigorous scientific critics.

Even in America, where academic studies in education were more highly developed, Kandel of Teachers College, Columbia was prepared to admit even as late as the 1950s that his department of educational psychology 'never enjoyed great esteem in academic circles',⁵¹ while his colleague, Rugg, lamented the disappearance of the controlled experiment and basic experimental research from American education after the 1920s, accepting that it must rest content with being an art and a technology, dependent on the findings of other sciences possessing true primary concepts.⁵²

In America such a lack of confidence arose not just from a feeling of being patronised by colleagues guilty of academic snobbery but also in part from impatience. The fate of America's children was an emotive topic and the financiers and supporters of the university teachers' colleges had looked for quick results from their investment. A 1952 Report to the U.S. Commission on the Financing of Higher Education observed that there were "few points at which the American faith in education has received less adequate practical expression than in the ... training of ... teachers."⁵³ and the fact that the scientific movement instituted by Thorndike and his colleagues did not produce instant nostrums for the system's ills was a profound disappointment.⁵⁴ Even where pure scientific standards were not in doubt, many

teachers came to share Bernard Shaw's impatience with conventional university activity - 'At the university every great treatise is postponed until its author attains impartial judgement and perfect knowledge. If a horse could wait as long for its shoes and would pay for them in advance, our blacksmiths would all be college dons'.⁵⁵

Progress was certainly slow in Britain. Almost thirty years after the foundation of the Scottish chairs in 1876 a letter in the *School World* could still begin, 'It is confidently affirmed that at present there is no science of education'⁵⁶ and thirty years after that - in 1930 - the chief executive of the Australian Council for Research could still detect in England, 'an atmosphere that was not conducive to experimentation or the real development of educational studies in general', one in which the new American ways of approaching educational issues were still suspected of 'shallowness and charlatanism'.⁵⁷ The result was that while other applied studies in the university, in Medicine, Agriculture, Engineering, *did* eventually appear to produce useful results, education found itself being criticised as much for its lack of a practical outcome as for its low academic standards⁵⁸ and this would certainly have seemed surprising to that considerable body of respectable nineteenth century opinion which had forcefully maintained that Education both could and would quickly establish itself as a respectable subject of academic and scientific concern for its own sake. Some, like Richter, had seen it as Newman saw theology or Leavis vernacular literature, as a queen of sciences embracing all the others: 'To write upon education,' he said, 'means to write upon almost everything at once; for it has to care for and watch over the development of an entire world in little - a microcosm of the macrocosm.'⁵⁹ Herbert Spencer also saw it as 'the subject which involves all the other subjects, and therefore the subject in which the education of everyone should culminate'.⁶⁰ For Horace Mann, 'no subject was, so comprehensive as that of education. Its circumference reaches around and outside and therefore embraces all other interests, human and divine.'⁶¹

At the same time, even its most eloquent advocates usually saw that the Science

of Education could perform also a narrower professional function in the style of Medicine or Law in which high theory could be constantly linked to practical needs and experience. Thus Gladstone in his rectorial address at Glasgow in 1879, welcoming 'social science' as 'a great growth of the day we live in', saw in first place among its various achievements, 'the organisation of teaching'.⁶²

Getting the science off the ground, in normal university terms, however, was not an easy matter.⁶³ Jolly, chief advocate of the Scottish chairs, could happily assert that "Education (was) a science having principles as philosophic and exact as other sciences, discoverable only by true scientific methods' but had to confess that while, on the continent, 'this truth has long been recognised ... In this country, the subject (had) not only no name, but as a science, hardly any existence.'⁶⁴ One of the problems, as Selleck has noted, was that even when 'Education was recognised as a science, educationists were not always agreed on what (that) science ... was'⁶⁵ and the Principal of Edinburgh, being taxed, on founding the chair, with the notion that such a science did not as yet even exist, retorted that it would be the task of the new professors to embark on "the collection and comparison of opinions and experiences"⁶⁶ and thus, presumably, to codify and create it themselves. Indeed, Payne, in the College of Preceptors, believed that the decision of the Edinburgh University Court to found the chair amounted in itself 'to an authoritative recognition of Education both as a Science and as an Art'⁶⁷ believing apparently that academic subjects are simply what actual academics teach, neither more nor less, and that by founding a new chair you found a new subject. For enthusiasts such as him, scepticism or disbelief were simply the normal concomitants of any new subject's appearance among the vested interests of academia.

Donaldson, Rector of Edinburgh High School and later Principal of St. Andrews, took an equally firm stand on Education's claim to academic recognition by the nation's clerisy, noting that in Germany it appeared incumbent on every leading member of the intellectual and literary world to make serious pronouncements on the

subject at some length in the course of their normal literary or academic activities⁶⁸ and Tibble saw the 1884 International Conference on Education as a key opportunity for countries such as Germany where educational studies and concerns were already strong, to exert a direct influence on others.⁶⁹ Certainly the decades that followed, with their growing emphasis on the empirical as well as the philosophical investigation of the subject were to see, in Findlay's words, a growing affirmation that this should not be 'the one sphere of human activity which (was) to be left to the vagaries of caprice'.⁷⁰

The most celebrated British advocate of such developments was probably the Aberdeen philosopher, Alexander Bain whose *Science of Education* published in 1879 remained a standard internationally known work for some decades.⁷¹ He did not however play any great part in the campaign to establish the Scottish chairs, preferring instead to exert his influence through the English-based Society for the Development of the Science of Education.⁷² This had been established at a meeting in the College of Preceptors in July 1875 and his prominent role in its activities reflected the influence that his writings on education were having and would continue to have. Even so that influence was perhaps not crucial. As R.H.Quick pointed out, Herbert Spencer was a far more successful writer in the field,⁷³ while Bain's central text was 'a dull book'⁷⁴ whose intended readership was never sufficiently clearly defined. 'The people who know all about mental science,' Quick suggested, 'will not care enough for education to read a book about the application of this science to education and I am quite sure that most people who have to do with education are too ignorant of mental science to get through the book with understanding and interest'⁷⁵ - a problem subsequently to be perennially faced by a subject sharing interests with a wide variety of sciences but too stretched ever to feel totally at home with any of them, one cause, perhaps of the subsequent widespread rejection of educationists by others in the academic world who saw them, in the words of Scruton, as "failures who had been unable to make their mark in any central area of their disciplines".⁷⁶

Some professors of education have attempted to evade this problem by eschewing eclecticism together, and taking refuge in the notion that they are not academic *educationists* as such but fully fledged professional Philosophers, Historians or Biologists who happen to be taking a special interest in applying their expertise to the narrower field of schooling. Indeed, this seemed such an obvious way out of academic opprobrium that the first two Scottish professors, Laurie and Meiklejohn, had both to spend time in their inaugurals⁷⁷ explaining why such an escape route would not work, just as Tibble was later to attack the influential Munn, in particular, for popularising the notion 'that educational principles can be derived from the study of some scientific field of enquiry outside education and then applied to educational practice.'⁷⁸ This was not to suggest that the study of History, Sociology or Economics was irrelevant to the academic discussion of schooling but to warn off those Biologists, Psychologists or Technologists who might claim to say the final word on topics such as pedagogy, that could only be studied adequately within a wider "science of education".

A common topic of journal articles from as early as the 1860s onwards was the very question, 'Is education an academic discipline?' or, framed rather differently, 'Is there, or can there be a true science of education?' to which, despite Bain and his successors, there was never in the following century to come a unanimous reply. The most notorious of early negatives came from a government minister, Lowe, who denied the very possibility of such a science⁷⁹ but equally negative, a century later, was the verdict of Taylor, head of the London Institute, for whom 'the current habit of regarding education as an autonomous discipline' seemed totally mistaken.⁸⁰ For him an education department was *ideally* a collection of specialists in other disciplines and his lack of belief in education as a single discipline was prompted precisely by a search for high standards and a high academic reputation. Bailyn suggests that it was by the end of the 1920s and in the 1930s that the earlier American belief in a "single discipline" approach came into question: "The various strands of traditional scholarship

that had been brought into combination in the centers of educational research either remained stubbornly separate ... or lost their resiliency".⁸¹

The pioneer British professors of the subject, however, were never to accept the specialist approach advocated by Munn and Taylor. They saw it as their duty to be polymaths, as the Scottish chairs' title, "Theory, History and Practice of Education", made clear. Indeed both Laurie and Meiklejohn, the first two Professors, saw their place in the university as being justified not merely by the claim of their subject itself to scientific treatment but because they were to develop a unified expertise appropriate to a generally recognised profession in the style of Medicine and Law, themselves amalgams of various separate academic disciplines. Such a polymath approach was in the best traditions of Scottish generalism (of which Bain himself was a great defender⁸²) and was to characterise many of the later Scottish heads of Department, notably Boyd, Rusk and Thomson as well as the Scottish Education degree, at which the best of their teaching was aimed.

The principle underlying the pioneers' claim to serve a profession was a traditional Scottish one, still being clearly enunciated by Principal Hetherington of Glasgow nearly a century later. For him, 'the universities should accept as falling within their province ... those professions whose basic disciplinary requirements are capable of being the instruments of a genuinely educational process ... The primary requirement (being) that ... the universities must give sovereign place to the educational rather than the professional end.'⁸³ Thus the educational value of a subject and its relevance to a recognised profession were seen by him as equally valid criteria for admission to the university canon as a research reputation or highly specialist rigour. Yet such a view was by no means universally accepted even at the time of Laurie and Meiklejohn let alone in the 1960s⁸⁴ by which time attacks on the Scottish University Education Departments for their academic dilettantism were becoming more vociferous, not least in Edinburgh.⁸⁵ Even so, professional relevance had apparently been a perfectly respectable criterion for the inclusion of Education in the curriculum of Oxford and

Cambridge, even if, at the former, it was not deemed worthy of a chair⁸⁶ and even if, at both, its academic status continued to be a shaky one.

Other doubts, even among those who accepted Hetherington's "professional" criteria, centred on the perennial difficulty already noted of reconciling theory and practice. Perhaps, it was felt, it would be safer if University Education Departments concentrated on theoretical issues. In a 1917 essay one writer, still suggesting, in the style of fifty years earlier that 'teacher-training can best be acquired in the class-room' urged that such departments should steer clear of offering advice to teachers and 'should be encouraged instead to develop systematic research in to the principles of teaching',⁸⁷ leaving practical advice to others, despite the fact that such sentiments were rarely heard in relation to the work of medical or agriculture departments. The College of Preceptors, also when founding their own chair in 1875 and wishing to form 'some definite conception of the work to be done by the occupant' had emphasised that he should be 'purely theoretical' in his approach, providing conscious opposition to those, who believed that teaching is 'a thing that comes by nature and can be undertaken at a moment's notice by those who have failed at everything else.'⁸⁸ Moreover, both the self and public esteem of the profession, the College of Preceptors believed, depended on the development of a science which gained respect for its own sake and not merely through being linked to practicalities or to socially prestigious university.

However, their success was clearly limited and opponents of the chair in the University of Michigan, being mooted at this same time, demanded first to see the technical literature in English, for, says Brubacher, even after 'the introduction of Pestalozzian and Herbartian notions in Europe, pedagogy still seemed in American eyes far from the sort of technical "mystery" that was worthy to occupy part of the American college curriculum',⁸⁹ though, ironically, such worthwhile literature as did exist was either produced or taken very seriously by the German universities, then the cynosure of most scientific Americans.

Selleck has indicated⁹⁰ that the richness of the models and theories flowing from abroad was so great that the emotions they generated could even damage the tender growth of Educational Studies through the premature stimulation of academic intra-disciplinary disputes. Thus much of the new confidence that flowed into British universities and colleges as a result of the Herbartian movement in the 1890s and 1900s was all too often frittered away in battles over the status of figures such as Rousseau ('a rogue and a sensualist' to Professor Hayward)⁹¹ who still featured prominently in the reading lists of rival departments ('solid, bourgeois and unimaginative,' said Hayward⁹²) such as those of the Scottish professors, who continued to be cautiously eclectic in their attempts to nurture a far from secure discipline and did not take kindly to being forced into unnecessarily partisan positions.

In the British Isles this debate over the desirability of university studies in Education had a long history. As early as 1828 a major exploration of the issues was certainly in progress, summed up at the time by Bryce, a later contender for the Edinburgh chair. He saw the task of his proposed education professors as twofold, combining the practical training of teachers in schools with the study of 'education as a liberal art, founded upon the philosophy of the Human Mind',⁹³ a combination already envisaged in an address to the proprietors of Brougham's so-called University of London founded two years earlier.⁹⁴ With considerable perception, Bryce saw that the need for respectable academic study lay not merely in its own usefulness but also in its value as a way of offsetting the damage done to teacher-training's image by the fact that all such schemes of training had hitherto been 'calculated only for the teachers of the *poor*, and that for this reason, if no other, the idea of training seemed for the moment socially unacceptable to the teachers of the not so poor as well as to the universities.

Certainly the teachers' own organisations as they emerged in the decades that followed, were continually aware of the possible links between the study of Education and social class. It was to them obvious that any closer link between their profession

and the academic world, hitherto dominated by the clergy, lawyers and doctors, could not fail to enhance their prestige while, less often perhaps, they were dimly aware that their own low social status led to an underrating in high academic and social circles of the body of knowledge derived from and concerned with their professional activities.

Plans for the forging of closer links between the profession and the universities were particularly noticeable in the speeches of those advocating the development of post-elementary education and Sir W.S. Maxwell addressing the Senate and General Council of Glasgow University in 1876 declared that "of the various remedies which have been proposed to stay the deterioration and extinction of the higher education in our public schools, one of the simplest and most efficacious is to restore their former and natural connection with our national universities. In times still recent nearly every parochial schoolmaster had enjoyed the benefit of a College (i.e. University) education.⁹⁵ Now every inducement which government can offer is held out to the members of the teaching profession to content themselves with the narrower training of a Normal School. If a university degree ... were made a qualification for a certificate, the schoolmasters of Scotland would soon again stand on the vantage-ground occupied by their predecessors."

Certainly enthusiasm over the university connection was particularly strong among the Scottish teachers, whose main organisation, the Educational Institute, founded in 1843, always placed an emphasis on the emulation of the other professions, church, law and medicine, that so dominated Scottish society and Scottish academic life. As the century wore on, the ideal of a professor in education in every university and a professional degree of some kind in every calendar dominated many an EIS congress and local branch meeting.⁹⁶

The Educational Institute, essentially based its campaign for the inclusion of education in the academic canon on the 'traditional' view enunciated by Maxwell, of

the parish schoolmaster as a university educated man. The fact that most Scottish teachers were by this time not parish schoolmasters at all and that a large number of them served in towns never touched by the parochial school system, was, in terms of this myth, seen merely as a temporary aberration produced by demographic upheaval, while the fact that so many even of the surviving parish schoolmasters turned out (according to Inspectors' reports) not to be university men at all, simply provided further evidence of the need for urgent action. The successful encouragement of graduation by the Dick trustees among the parish schoolmasters of North East Scotland had shown what could be done.⁹⁷

The involvement of the university in Scottish teacher education was thus never seen as an innovation. Access to university in Scotland was already easier than in England⁹⁸ and the idea of a graduate teacher profession was always presented by its advocates as a traditional phenomenon of medieval origin, calculated to appeal as readily to those 'anglicisers' among the Scottish professoriate who consciously cherished the models of Oxford and Cambridge⁹⁹ as to those of nationalist sentiments.¹⁰⁰ Such an appeal to the Middle Ages fitted in with the generally Gothic instincts of a Scottish academia that had recently approved the ornate new buildings of Glasgow University and Marischal College in Aberdeen, and it was an appeal likely to dispel the less romantic image of 'the teacher' as a product of modern industrialism largely identified with proletarian needs and alienated from high culture. A similarly medieval emphasis was embodied in the title of the highly successful Teachers Guild which, though English in origin, had a number of branches in Scotland and, under the leadership of Laurie, was seeking to raise the status of all teachers in whatever sector.

The projection of a respectable image was made easier by the fact that the EIS still had in its ranks not merely elementary teachers and parish schoolmasters but many of the staff of the prestigious High Schools and Academies whose career structure was coterminous with that of the universities themselves, as well as actual

university professors, keen on emphasising their teaching role, and their relationship with the profession in general. Thus the appeal to continuity with the medieval system was not an entirely empty one. The very title "Master of Arts" had originally indicated a qualification to teach and some writers maintained that in certain essentials the Scottish universities had maintained a hold on medieval traditions that Oxford and Cambridge with their 'outer husk of the past' had really lost¹⁰¹ even though Lyon Playfair suggested that it was the atrophy produced by this Scottish attachment to medieval forms that had 'allowed profession after profession to slip away from them' and that, ironically, 'nothing (was) more strange ... than their abandonment of the teaching profession which was their own creation'.¹⁰²

The growing emphasis in Scotland on the idea of teacher graduation as well as on the high level academic development of Education as a subject area as well as the medieval antecedents was in many ways predictable. The use of external symbols such as degrees for the recognition of status was, as McPherson points out,¹⁰³ one of the characteristics of *Gesellschaft* generally manifesting themselves in the late nineteenth century Scottish universities. Moreover, with the granting of the parliamentary franchise to the General Councils of the Scottish universities, the encouragement of teacher graduation by the EIS was eventually to secure both the election of a Scottish teacher member and a considerable increase in the profession's influence both nationally and inside the universities.¹⁰⁴

In England, of course, such arguments found it harder to gain ground, for there were clearly not one but two teaching professions.¹⁰⁵ As Tropp continually emphasises,¹⁰⁶ the new elementary teachers thrown up by nineteenth century developments were not only never regarded as professionals in the social class sense but were seen as a quite separate body from the Grammar and Public Schoolmasters who alone could plausibly, and by their wearing of academic dress and their emphasis on graduation usually *did*, claim medieval origins but they were claimed more as a mark of *caste* than as a symbol of professional aspiration. The elementary teachers

came almost exclusively from a lowly social background and their training was as much concerned with the imparting of basic social manners and middle-class forms of piety as with the inculcation of academic and pedagogical skills, while the English Schoolmasters saw no need for any special professional training at all, given that the vast majority of them had already acquired sufficient social status either through birth or by ordination as clergymen. Thus Fitch was able to observe in 1876 that 'the two departments of schoolwork (were) not in Scotland separated by so broad a gulf - whether as regards their character or their agents - as in England', and it seemed more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that an increasingly threatened professional unity might well be saved and strengthened in Scotland by a major university intervention. Donaldson was just one of those who saw it under threat in the 1870s.¹⁰⁷ Fitch also observed, as Bryce had done fifty years earlier that 'in both countries, the fact (remained) that, hitherto, normal training had been confined to teachers in schools for the poor' and that the *training* of secondary teachers was just as essential for the maintenance of a single profession as the provision of a better basic education, in the university sector, for the elementary teachers.¹⁰⁸

In fact, in Scotland, both needs were to be largely met during the next half century. By the outbreak of the first world war, teacher-training was to become incumbent on all but a handful of independent school teachers, while the great majority of male as well as a high proportion of female elementary teachers were to be university students and in most cases, eventually graduates.¹⁰⁹

Yet the earlier, superficial resemblance of the Scottish elementary teachers to their English counterparts had, in spite of the appearance of professional unity projected by the EIS, become culturally significant enough for public attitudes towards them to take on an English tone,¹¹⁰ and for the attitude of some university leaders in Scotland to remain a patronising one, even after their Arts Faculties in particular had become increasingly dependent on elementary school teachers' fees.¹¹¹ Some professors indeed saw a career even in secondary teaching as a "waste" of good students.

Hedley, professor of History in Glasgow, for example, informed the 1912 Royal Commission on the Civil Service that though most students came to the university with their intentions fixed, "we save some of the better ones from teaching and draft them into other professions"¹¹² and while Hedley himself may have been more anxious about their financial welfare than actually despising of teachers as such, there was undoubtedly a continuing scepticism not only among Senate members but also among other students about their specialist study areas of Education and Psychology, and also, on occasions, a certain aversion from the budding elementary teacher's life-style.

Many of the recruits to elementary teaching were, as in England, working class in origin and the non-residential universities of Scotland, unlike the residential teacher training colleges of England, made no deliberate attempt to 'gentle' their students.¹¹³ Their aim remained purely one of intellectual training, sometimes, in the case of Ordinary courses, at a relatively low level. Social comment in the Edinburgh and Glasgow universities of the early twentieth century hardly saw in the bulk of teacher graduands a body of trainee professionals about to take social rank alongside their fellow students in law and medicine, who dominated the social life and journalism of the contemporary universities. In the autumn of 1910 Shaw, the Lord Advocate, actually called for the opening of residential Training Colleges to overcome "the coarseness of Scottish students"¹¹⁴ and a 1911 editorial in the Edinburgh newspaper *Student*¹¹⁵ portrayed the ordinary teacher as a 'vulgar' figure with no table manners and few interests likely to keep up his spirits amid small town life, and while there is some evidence that the article was meant to be a hoax (the author turned out to be A.S.Neill¹¹⁶) it was sufficiently near the truth in its portrayal of general attitudes for it to give great offence. The mere fact of being an elementary teacher and thus linked to the state system could still cancel out any of the added status that might be accorded by graduation. The Aberdeen student magazine in 1934 noted that it was "becoming increasingly obvious to a large percentage of students that their fate (was) to be the

T.C. (the training centre where they attended the graduate teacher-training course). Few (would) regard this fate as the ideal consummation to a varsity career ... The T.C. (being) intimately connected with the schools and the County Councils etc., the personnel of which are notoriously incapable of competent judgement ...¹¹⁷ while the mere presence of budding elementary teachers (and their related studies?) in the university could even be seen as a threat to general standards.

One Edinburgh student's letter in 1937¹¹⁸ publicly suggested that 'a great many people (were) scraping into the university, taking little part in its life' and claimed that '...if a university degree were no longer required for elementary school teaching ... many of these people would no longer come to the universities (then) the university population would be smaller and their intellectual average higher. Some, therefore, would exclude prospective school teachers immediately'; while another student journalist in the St. Andrews of 1950 felt that such people actually excluded themselves, 'In truth they are three parts teacher already ... an alien thing ... to the university world'.¹¹⁹

The presence of hundreds of teacher-trainees in the universities did not necessarily, therefore, guarantee their social acceptance. At the same time no Scottish university would have had the financial courage to exclude them. Peddie (Executive Officer of the National Committee for the Training of Teachers) claimed that in 1926, those intending to be teachers formed "on a moderate estimate" 60% of the men and 80% of the women in the Faculties of Arts and "not less than 50% (both men and women) in the Faculties of Science".¹²⁰ Even so, despite such a wide entry for recruits to the teaching profession, once the possibility of the universities' offering them *professional* training as well as a degree had been prevented by the changes of 1905-06, Educational Studies as an academic subject came increasingly to be studied only by an increasingly select band of post-graduate students.

It is therefore important to emphasise that despite the successful EIS campaign for

the admission of all male teachers to the universities and for an academic recognition of their professional studies, there was an increasing tendency for the Scottish universities to concentrate more and more on providing simply the 'higher' forms of the latter. Thus Laurie, the first Edinburgh professor of education, though profoundly interested in questions of primary teaching, was increasingly forced to concentrate on the needs of secondary teachers, and to leave elementary training largely to the training colleges.¹²¹

Such a shift of concern did undoubtedly reflect some basic university attitudes. The ex-professor, Lyon Playfair, MP for St. Andrews and Edinburgh universities, and a great parliamentary supporter of both the profession and the chairs, actually introduced a Professional Regulation Bill in 1879 which would have specifically excluded elementary teachers from its purview¹²² and the continued existence of professional divisions in Scotland, despite universal male graduation and the early acceptance of Educational Studies by the universities, was to be demonstrated by the recurring desire on the part of the new secondary teachers, possibly under the influence of English models, to regulate their own affairs apart from the EIS and by the eventually total abandonment of the Institute by its professorial members. It was ironic therefore that Scottish influence, particularly that of Laurie, did much to foster the notion in England of a profession united by university involvement. In the 1890s, Bibby suggests, 'it looked for a while ... as if the way was to be opened for university graduation by prospective teachers of the (English) lower classes' and he notes how Scottish examples were continually being quoted by the Teachers Guild¹²³ in its campaign to that end.

The Day Training colleges established for both elementary and secondary training in London and the new provincial universities and university colleges of England were generally hailed as Laurie's creation¹²⁴ and it was his influence that seems to have made Adams (from Glasgow) the head of the London University Day Training College that was eventually to become the London Institute.¹²⁵ Such Colleges were

deliberately founded on Scottish, non-residential lines without the 'gentling' purpose of the older English training centres. Yet, in the end, they too were to fall into the hands of the more natural university patrons, the Grammar School teachers and, as in Scotland, elementary training was to return to the non-university sector, nourishing perhaps a growing belief, reinforced by the influential attitudes of Oxford, Cambridge and North America that while low level educational studies might be tolerated, as long as they were profitable, they could hardly be welcomed in the university community for their own sake.¹²⁶

English government reports from Bryce in the 1890s to McNair in the 1940s were to acknowledge, as McNair put it, that 'England ... has never attached enough importance to education and has therefore never given to the teaching profession the esteem that it needs and deserves'¹²⁷ and in Scotland also there was a feeling that despite the many successes of EIS campaigning - the University Education Chairs, compulsory graduation for male and secondary teachers and the establishment of a professional degree to set alongside the BD and the LLB - the profession still lacked the esteem that it needed and that it felt it deserved. The university connection did not deliver what was expected of it. Indeed, instead of a united, high status Scottish teaching profession, they had one increasingly divided into Ordinary and Honours graduates, into Primary and Secondary teachers, with only a tiny group attempting the advanced degree course that was to have been the universal badge of the profession's committed elite.

The problem was perhaps that the EIS had expected too much of the university link, and had often indulged in slogans when detailed planning was required. Its advocates had been and continued to be, unsure about what they wanted the long desired Chairs to do. What did they mean by the 'Faculties of Education' or a 'Degree in Education' that they were continually demanding from the Courts and Senates? Was the latter, for example, to be an initial training degree on the lines of the post-Robbins BEd or a prestigious, second degree designed for a cadre of potential

leaders? Were the Faculties to deal with the general education of teachers or merely with their professional studies?

Some saw in the university connection merely a promise of social prestige and very little else. Gibson, Rector of the Nicholson Institute, Stornoway, in welcoming the chairs, claimed that whatever would improve the status of the teachers and the dignity of their profession was to be encouraged. He saw in the university connection simply a compensation for the fact that the 'rector scholarum' (the medieval touch again) had once been 'a citizen of great importance, who in public affairs often took a worthy place among nobles and distinguished clerics, but was 'not so regarded in modern times ... Those for example, who distribute public honours overlook him. Such honours are frequently bestowed on successful businessmen or leaders of great industries; actors, authors, engineers, scientists, physicians, lawyers receive occasional State recognition, but whoever heard of a schoolmaster, the maker of men and moulder of citizens, receiving a Knighthood?'¹²⁸

Other EIS leaders, however, while welcoming the dignity that a wider spread of academic titles in the profession might bring, were genuinely anxious that teacher-training and professional work should be dignified by being more scientifically based in the style of Germany and France. Current American writings suggested that university based educational studies in Scotland might one day guarantee the emergence of a body of respected professional leaders for both the schools and for the new administrative services. In Brubacher's view such a purpose had indeed been the mainspring of the education movement in the American universities,¹²⁹ with the supporters of the new university-based teachers colleges less interested in initial teacher training except as a means of financing other developments. They looked 'forward to the day when (their) principal work could be pitched at the post-graduate level' and thus at potential leaders, a foreshadowing of events in Scotland.

Eventually there was to be much discussion in the EIS of the benefits of

scholarship and especially of research 'to vitalise methods, to banish routine ... to prove the value by scientific experimentation of well-worn rules of instruction and to show how accepted ways of teaching square with the laws of psychological development',¹³⁰ and the Institute itself was to be one of the prime movers in the establishment of a Scottish Council for Research in Education.¹³¹

However, it is doubtful if the attractions of such a development of theory and research touched more than a minority of the Institute's members. The rhetoric surrounding the foundation of the Chairs themselves usually concentrated on a restoration of the traditional *status* of the profession in Scotland, reflecting the current uncertainty surrounding both the teachers' relationship to the state under the Revised Code and the future role of the parish schoolmasters, following the Act of 1872.

Larson, commenting on concurrent American developments, has suggested that it was because of the teachers' totally subordinate position in the bureaucratised schools system 'that more solidarity and cohesion became necessary there and that the collective advancement of school-teaching, as an aspiring occupation, always depended more closely on unions and unionist tactics than in almost any other semi-profession'. In the USA, he believed, the 'as yet uncertain science of pedagogy proved a less promising fulfiller of teachers' hopes'.¹³² In Scotland, however, at least until the second war, the search for the academic acceptance of 'pedagogy' as a respectable academic career through the establishment of "chairs", "degrees" and "faculties" was itself often seen as a potent 'unionist tactic',¹³³ given the grip of professionalism on the Scottish class system, and it was commonly believed that once there had been an acceptance of the teachers' high status and equality within the university, by the lawyers, doctors and ministers, then all other marks of a high status profession would come the teachers' way, not least in the form of increased salaries and improved conditions of service.

This had, at one time, been a common English view. An 1874 article in the

Schoolmaster suggested that because a proper professional course of study had never been established for teachers in England, they were never assigned any special academical position and "*very much in consequence of this*, their pay ... (was) always inferior to (that) of the other learned professions",¹³⁴ and this, of course had also been the view of Bryce 50 years earlier. Thus the mere creation of the Chairs was often seen not so much as a mere worthy aim but as a bread-and-butter issue for the whole Scottish profession and what the professors would actually do *was* thus a secondary issue. Yet, 30 years later, the second Edinburgh professor, Darroch, was to see in the social and financial improvement of teaching the prerequisite for, rather than a result of the academic acceptance of his subject area.¹³⁵ In the 1930s a Jordanhill student was still able to express astonishment (after the chairs had been in existence for sixty years) to find fellow-students who actually *wanted* to be teachers. 'But they are the meek and humble of heart', he confessed,¹³⁶ hardly portraying the buoyant new professionals that the EIS leaders of the 1870s had assumed the chairs would produce. Yet, amazingly, even this Jordanhill student could still believe that the situation would radically improve if a Chair and Faculty of Education were established in Glasgow.

The EIS leaders of the mid twentieth century, however, even though they still sought a Glasgow and an Aberdeen chair, could no longer see in such things any guaranteed improvement of their social status or standard of living. In the search for those they gradually turned instead to professional self-regulation through a Teachers' Council and to the formulation of agreed professional standards. University involvement might help but it was not enough in itself and even EIS members deeply involved in the university developments agreed. Boyd, head of the Glasgow University Education Department and leading champion of research within the EIS, encouraged their Conference as early as the 1920s to call for community rather than university endorsement and to remember that 'the possession of a university degree and equipment with the developing resources of an educational science do not ... give an

absolute guarantee ... The experience of the past is that only when a body of men are set apart from their fellows by special education and training and encouraged *by general esteem* to develop a sound professional pride, can they then be trusted to fulfil the expectations of the community they serve', regardless, he implied, of what the universities and the other professions might think.¹³⁷

Moreover, in time, the profession itself and many EIS members in particular began to resent the attempts of the new Educational Science that they themselves had helped to establish, to pass judgement on their own way of doing things. Science was fine as a means of conferring status but it was not always so welcome when it posed an expensive or embarrassing challenge to established practice or when it undermined vested interests. The holding of the advanced education degree, in particular, was not always welcomed by colleagues in school staff rooms.

Wilensky, in an article generalising American experience, distinguishes five 'regular steps in the natural history of a profession'.¹³⁸ First, there is a full-time commitment to a task (a stage not historically traceable in the case of the teachers). Second comes the organisation of training and third, the organisation of a professional association by those who have satisfactorily undergone such training. So far as the Scottish teachers were concerned the second and third steps were reversed. Their association had largely been formed to demand adequate training, though what Wilensky calls the 'further self-conscious definition of core-tasks' that comes from specialised functioning and the 'contrast between the old guard who learned the hard way and the newcomers who took the prescribed course' were certainly to be discerned in subsequent Scottish developments, just as his fourth step - seeking legal support for the defining of job territory and professional membership, and fifth, the working out of a professional code of practice and ethics were to be exemplified by the Educational Institute's preoccupation in the third quarter of the twentieth century with the creation and firm establishment of a General Teaching Council.¹³⁹ The embracing of such a new strategy was probably inevitable once the "university

strategy", crowned by the establishment of the advanced education degree by all four universities between 1916 and 1920, had failed to deliver all that was expected of it and though the Institute's campaign for chairs and faculties of education continued, its belief in it naturally waned.

One of the problems was that the profession's earlier influence on university affairs had itself begun to wane. Following the emergence of the University Grants Committee and the general increase in direct State funding universities became far less dependent commercially on the cultivation of local goodwill. Their recruitment net began to be spread far wider. The quality of students became just as important as the quantity, and just as the English Universities' Day Training Colleges had decanted their remaining elementary teacher recruits to the non-university colleges, so the Scottish universities welcomed the opportunity to jettison any remaining non-graduating students and to distance themselves even further from the college sector. After 1925 even the Education Chairs were, by arrangement with government, combined with the leadership of the local colleges so that their involvement in the university proper was kept to a minimum, and despite the early hopes by the professors themselves that from such an arrangement an American system of University Teachers Colleges was about to develop in Edinburgh and St. Andrews, Education moved more and more to the edge of the universities' concern.

Symptomatically, the University General Councils, consisting of all the graduates and therefore a traditional vehicle for expressing EIS opinion, began to lose their earlier influence over the Courts and Senates, which were now concerned less with local need and the opinions of the old professions than with the pressures of government policy and with the needs of the various national and international professions of the academic subjects themselves. In a remarkable 1935 outburst, the Business Committee of the Aberdeen General Council chided not merely the EIS but even the Institute of Chemists and the General Medical Council for attempting to direct university affairs.¹⁴⁰ As for an EIS suggestion that teachers should have some

say in the content of degrees, such a proposal, it said "reveals an entire misconception of the purpose and meaning of a university, nor are any of her degrees intended merely to be a key to unlock the door of the teaching profession". This was a far cry from earlier decades when successive, financially hard-pressed Principals of Aberdeen had courted the teaching profession so assiduously. The truth was that in one sense the EIS campaign had been too successful for the permanent enforcement of graduation on male and secondary school recruits to the profession in the 1920s had now guaranteed the universities a massive, regular income for the continuation of which no further gestures need be made either to the EIS or to the profession in general. Moreover since 1907 when government had made it finally clear that they would in no circumstances abandon their control of actual professional training and would confine it to their own college sector, the Scottish universities had even been barred from developing the grammar school training courses that were the distinctive mark of the English universities' Education Departments. In Scotland therefore, the universities had had to confine their activity to providing on the one hand a general education for all male and many female recruits to teaching and on the other, high level studies in Education and Psychology at a level even higher than in Laurie's secondary school training, for what was now merely the handful of self-selected graduate enthusiasts who chose to do the purely academic Diploma and the advanced Education Degree.

Yet, elsewhere in the United Kingdom, since the beginning of the century, the position had been very different. The *general* education of the majority of teachers now usually took place outside the university altogether while the teacher-training of graduates, such as it was, took place almost entirely *inside* it.¹⁴¹ Moreover until after 1945, there were to be few of the Scottish style post-graduate courses designed specifically for the profession's leaders, except in a London Institute where Scottish attitudes were still influential and mere size produced greater affluence and opportunities.

The purpose of the chapters which follow is not merely to trace the course of the Scottish events in more detail and to offer explanations for this outcome but also to examine the nature and to assess the importance of what was probably the most important product of the way in which Scottish university studies in education developed – the Scottish advanced degree.

Although it had been intended by some university figures largely as a symbolic response to the EIS demands for a prestigious equivalent of the BD and LLB, others, the Psychology Professor Drever in particular saw in the degree a means whereby Scotland could enter the world of German and American educational scholarship. In the end, its significance was probably more professional than scientific, providing as it did an entree for teachers not merely to the higher reaches of the school profession itself, but to specialist positions in administration, teacher-training and psychology. For long it remained the major Scottish honours degree in the latter subject, even after a 'pure' degree in Psychology had been established and until the 1960s it remained the biggest single recruiting agent to the school psychology service and child guidance clinics not merely of Scotland but of England.

Despite Hamilton's description of it as "an important preparatory school for what might be called the superintendent class in education",¹⁴² even in these specialised fields, the degree never became, as the EIS had hoped, an American-style prerequisite for professional appointment or advancement and in the face of English specialist course developments after 1960, there was in the end an enforced dismantling of the degree's traditional Scottish generalism. Its English-style successor, the Master of Education though not entirely specialist, was to be far less distinguishable than the old degree from the study forms of most English-speaking universities. By 1970 Scottish educational studies had been largely subsumed, like most university studies, into the patterns of an international profession for which the Educational Institute, the parochial schoolmaster tradition and Scottish generalism were little more than historical curiosities. However, during the more distinctively Scottish period of

educational studies now under review they meant a great deal, though their distinctiveness derived not merely from the nature of the Scottish profession and universities but from the unique approach to teacher training adopted in Scotland by the British government when compared with that which it adopted in England, and pre-partition Ireland. Thus any attempt to examine the role and fate of the university education departments cannot be examined outside the context of changes in Scottish educational institutions as a whole. The failure of the EIS to defend the Edinburgh education chair when its survival was threatened in the 1960s in contrast to their enthusiastic defence of the far less important St. Andrews chair when it was threatened in the 1920s, provides a major demonstration of a change in attitude to professional studies and the role of the universities in Scottish schooling during those forty years.

The endemic mistrust of university educational studies found elsewhere was never widespread in Scotland so long as the pursuit of such studies promised to bring general professional enhancement to teachers and new finance to the universities themselves. In the 1960s, however, Scottish faith began to falter. Whereas the first generation of educational administrators in Scotland continually turned to Philosophers to back their judgements¹⁴³ and thus found themselves generally in tune with the university departments of their day, their successors in the 1960s were more concerned with the minutiae of curriculum and management issues, expertise in which was now, as a result of government encouragement, largely centred in the Colleges of Education. These Colleges, indeed, now formed so influential and powerful a sector that, even the EIS was ready to accept that the new post-Robbins Bachelor of Education degree, which accorded the universities a mere supportive rather than a central role in the provision of a professional qualification, should be largely the Colleges' responsibility. This change involved a withdrawal of many intending teachers from the classrooms of the university under a scheme that ironically sought not merely a further move to an all graduate profession but a real legitimization of the

Colleges, in the way that the profession had sought legitimation of itself by way of the Chairs a century earlier. In such a situation, the university Departments found themselves ever more remote from the centre of events and still seeking the clear role that had eluded them for ninety years or more.

It would be easy to assume that it was merely fate that had brought them to this pass. There is evidence, however, that there was in Scotland one body that not only relished but may even have planned such an outcome, namely government itself. Throughout the history of the Scottish chairs, there was evidence that those who controlled what Smith called "as absolute an autocracy as it is possible to picture under any modern regime"¹⁴⁴ that is, the Scottish Education Department, were permanently anxious to keep the control of the numbers and nature of recruits to the teaching profession out of the hands of the University Education Professors and Departments. Having refused to support the establishment of the first Chairs, they not only chose instead to support their own College sector and its aspirations but showed considerable scepticism about the development of Education as a respectable academic discipline. In January 1879, if the Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals is to be believed, an anonymous article was contributed to the *Quarterly Review* by Henry Craik, subsequently to the Secretary of SED, which poured scorn on the idea of "indoctrining" teachers into the "so-called principles of the science of pedagogy" which they were expected "to carry into practice on the poor little Arabs committed to their care". His successors were often to be equally sceptical about the theoreticians' contribution to the education service, particularly when situated not in state-financed Colleges but in Universities, from which they could launch attacks on government with impunity and while it is true that Craik and his immediate successor, Struthers, had sufficient respect for university values to preside over the creation of a graduate male profession, even such a move has been seen by Ozga and Lawn as a massive piece of manipulative pacification by the state of a profession to whose regulations it is permanently in thrall.¹⁴⁵ Carr-Saunders and Wilson, writing in 1933, estimated that

"about four fifths of the better qualified part of the teaching profession" in England was "in effect state qualified".¹⁴⁶ In Scotland the proportion was always very much higher. It seems reasonable to suppose therefore that the form and degree of any professional advancement should also be largely in the hands of the state - as the Scottish University Education Departments were to find to their cost.

NOTES

1. This description of education as an academic subject appears, unascrbed, in a literature survey by Bailyn (1963) p 126.
2. Struthers (1875) pp 20-21.
3. In the United States alone, according to Bailyn, there were, by 1920, some 46 University Teachers Colleges "and all but the most amoebic liberal arts colleges and universities had divisions of education complete with ... regular thrones in such powerful institutions as Teachers' College and the Faculty of Education at the University of Chicago". (Bailyn, 1963, p 128).
4. Rugg (1952) p 34 suggests that by the end of the second world war, Columbia University Teachers College alone was granting 2,000 master's degrees and 50 doctor's degrees per year.
5. The major survey of Hinsdale (1900) noted that the first permanent American chair - at Michigan - had been established a mere twenty-one years earlier.
6. Conant (1963) p 1.
7. Brubacher and Rudy (1968) p 220.
8. Ford (1964) p 135.
9. Rugg (1952) p 3.
10. Harvard Committee (1960) p v.
11. Bailyn (1963) p 125.
12. Darroch (1903a) pp 3-4.
13. Letter to *Glasgow University Magazine* 28 Jan 1931.
14. Armytage (1955b) p 1.
15. The first Edinburgh professor, Laurie, had made the same literary allusion in his own inaugural 79 years earlier. Laurie (1876) p 18.
16. Butterfield (1962) p 3.
17. Payne (1886) p 7. This view was echoed also by English writers eg in Payne (1871) p 107 where one writer comments on the currently poor intellectual standards in the Public Schools.
18. Quoted by Storr (1899) p 373.
19. Moon (1973) p 441 "Archie John went off to the School of Army Education at Castle Buchanan. I don't like his becoming so taken up with Education" (Journal entry 30 Jun 1948).
20. Conant (1963) p 1.

21. Brubacher (1947) p 518. In the Harvard Committee Report of 1966 p 79 he is described as always having "disliked normal school pedagogy".
22. Scruton in the *Times* 3 Jul 1984.
23. Clarke (1943) p 17.
24. Ford (1969) p 135.
25. Conant (1963) p 7. A charge echoed by Torrance (1981) p 47, who describes much of the American influence on European education as "anti-intellectual".
26. Simpson (1954) p 115.
27. Even Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) as sociologists of the profession appear to assume (p 250) that what differentiated teachers from other professionals was that there was "no technique which they had to acquire".
28. Payne (1880) p 17.
29. Findlay (1903) p 18.
30. Reay (1885) p 12.
31. Brehaut (1973) p 5.
32. Clarke (1943) cited by Brehaut.
33. Laurie (1888) p 43.
34. Storr (1899) p 373.
35. Quoted by Bibby (1961) p 247.
36. Laurie and Meiklejohn in their inaugurals (1876).
37. Bantock (1953) p 342 quoting an article in the *Times Educational Supplement*. The post-graduate training course, it said, might "do more harm than good" and certainly could not "implant personality".
38. Rusk (1932) p 13.
39. Laurie (1888) p 47.
40. Lilley (1906) p 54.
41. Hendy (1920) p 10.
42. Browning (1881) p vii, though it is interesting to notice how the Scottish writer, Drever (1912) anxious also to avoid an appearance of pedantry, introduced his book on Greek Education by claiming that it was not "by a classical scholar for classical scholars but by a student of Education for students of Education", suggesting a

greater self-confidence in the current world of Scottish educational studies.

43. Quoted by Tibble (1966) p 4. Though by financing a lecture course in Edinburgh, Bell made it clear that he was not opposed to the discussion of educational theory as such. Southey (1844) p 403 ff.
44. Conant (1963) p 1 "(As a professor) I felt confident that I was an excellent teacher and I had developed my skill by experience, without benefit of professors of education".
45. Lindroth (1976) pp 208-9.
46. Bibby (1961) p 246.
47. Tyson and Tuck (1971) p 14.
48. Taylor (1964) p 29.
49. Morris (1972) p 12.
50. Brehaut (1973). Clarke (1943) p 24 speaks also of the Englishman's preference for the 'hunch' over scientific analysis of a problem.
51. Kandel (1949) p 703. He suggested it was because of its early links with elementary education. As a result of this link, it shared the low status of that sector. (See the discussion of Bryce below.)
52. Rugg (1947) p 802.
53. Quoted by Hofstadter and Hardy (1952) p 94.
54. A particularly graphic account of some of the disappointments of applying science to education appears in Callahan (1962).
55. Shaw (1903) p 230.
56. *School World* May 1904.
57. Cunningham (1934) pp 51-3.
58. Bynner has suggested that such a lack of success by theoreticians in generalising outside the laboratory, may lead to a questioning of the whole basis of research in the relevant discipline. Bynner (1980) p 315.
59. Richter. Quoted in *Educational Review (New York)* Oct 1903 p 236.
60. Spencer (1864) pp 162-3.
61. Mann quoted by Payne (1886) p 280.
62. Gladstone (1879) p 32.
63. As Adamson (1930) chapter XVII makes clear. Bailyn (1963) blames this in part on the desire to make it something "grander ... more esoteric and more important" than a mere discipline" (p 126).

64. Jolly (1874) p 353.
65. Selleck (1968) p 275.
66. Grant in his Opening Address for the Session in the University, reported in the *Scotsman* 2 Nov 1875.
67. Payne (1880) p 332. His combination of "science and art" was not a glib one. The distinction between them was one of his favourite themes.
68. Donaldson (1874) p 36. He specifically quoted examples from Herder, Goethe, Richter, Kant, Hegel and Schleiermacher before even mentioning any specialist writer in the field of education.
69. Tibble (1966) p 2.
70. *Child Study* Vol II Jul 1909.
71. *Alma Mater* 28 Feb 1894 observed that in a recent French dictionary the only point of interest noted with regard to Aberdeen was that it was the birthplace of Bain.
72. His autobiography (1904) makes no mention of the chairs or any of the surrounding controversy and enthusiasm, especially strong in Aberdeen in itself. In addressing the English society, he mentions Scottish philosophers but never the new Scottish professors (Bain 1879b). Such omissions were common in London addresses of the time. See, for example, the society's inaugural lecture by Zincke (1876) delivered in the very month that the two Scottish professors took office. Bain was, however, a welcome lecturer at the Aberdeen branch of the Educational Institute of Scotland. Bain (1904) p 408.
73. Withrington writing the foreword to Smith and Hamilton (1980) hints also that Bain's unorthodox religious views may have cut him off from the mainstream of Scottish education. This was particularly true in America.
74. Quick (1890) p 455. His verdict that Bain's failing was his dullness is shared by Humes (1980) p 17. Darroch, in Laurie (1912), suggests that Bain's failure lay in the fact that he excluded both physical and technical education from the province of educational theory and limited the consideration of method "... to a study of the conditions requisite for the betterment of the retentive powers of the pupil" (p 199).
75. Quoted by Storr (1899) p 526.
76. *Times* 3 Jul 1984.
77. Laurie (1876) and Meiklejohn (1876).
78. Tibble (1966) p 14.
79. *Museum* 1864.

80. Taylor (1964) p 28.
81. Bailyn (1963) p 129. He himself, as an historian, (p 138) felt that the evidence indicated it was *not* a discipline and that the assumption that it was, was likely to be "fruitless and frustrating".
82. Humes (1980) p 17.
83. Hetherington (1953) p 18.
84. Indeed, the Harvard Report of 1966 (p 87) blames over-concern with professional issues as a reason for the alienation of Education from the remainder of the University.
85. See Chapter 7.
86. Barnard (1961) p 190.
87. Roscoe (1917) p 220.
88. College of Preceptors (1896).
89. Brubacher (1947) p 514.
90. Selleck (1968) p 255.
91. Hayward (1905) p 7. He talks of the "simian sentiments" of Rousseau and of *Emile* as "the most audacious work known to the History of Education ... saturated from cover to cover with the spirit of nihilist animalism". It was always a popular set book in all four Scottish universities.
92. Hayward (1912) p 27. John Adams provided an introduction to this volume. "I know of (no) book in education," he wrote, "likely to compete with this in the number of antagonisms it is calculated to arouse". *Ibid.* p v.
93. Bryce (1828) p v.
94. Morgan (1833) p 30. In his view, "the Professor of Education should possess a knowledge of more than the general principles of all the sciences".
95. The myth of the university-educated parish schoolmaster does not stand in isolation. It fits into a whole mythology of earlier, especially Highland Scottish life. Smith (1913) p 28 writes of "these Highland folk yearning for the gift of knowledge, sacrificing a share of their lone subsistence to enjoy its benefits and esteeming the achievement a priceless boon to be shared direct with others (in which) we see the pathos of human aspiration, the pride of race and the sympathy of kinship. It ... shows the elemental springs of our necessities.
96. That this was true is amply documented in the chapters which follow.
97. Laurie (1890), though Anderson (1983) p 133 suggests this was the

result of nineteenth century improvement rather than a manifestation of the myth in action.

98. The Argyll Commission estimated that there was one university place per 1,000 population in Scotland compared with a mere one per 5,800 in England, though Anderson (1983) p 157 adds a reminder that in England medicine and law were at that time taught largely outside the universities. Stuart, at the opening ceremony of University College Dundee in 1883 noted that Scotland had one university per one million people, whereas England had one per six million and claimed also that Scotland had, in actual figures, more university students than any other country in Europe. Playfair made a further distinction between the Scottish and Irish universities on the one hand and the ancient English universities on the other, which made the former far more likely to succeed as the trainers of school teachers. They, he claimed, taught a man how to earn £1,000 a year with dignity and intelligence whereas the latter merely taught him to spend it with dignity and intelligence. *Hansard* House of Commons 20 Jun 1889.
99. This is the group most strongly attacked by Davie (1961) though others suggest that his individual targets are not always the most appropriate ones.
100. It appealed also to those in touch with the German universities, where the medieval links between theology and pedagogy had lingered on well into the eighteenth century and where pedagogical qualifications could still be demanded of the clergy in some states of the Empire. McClelland (1980) p 177.
101. Burns and Sutherland-Graeme (1944) p v.
102. Playfair addressing the St. Andrews Graduate Association in 1873, quoted by Malloch (1919) p 266.
103. McPherson (1973) p 176.
104. Anderson (1983) p 92 "because of their electoral functions ... (the General Councils) always carried a good deal of political weight".
105. As Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) put it (p 251) "The teachers of elementary schools occupied humble positions and between them and the Headmaster of Eton there was a great gulf fixed".
106. Tropp (1957) eg p 169.
107. In an address to the Angus and Mearns Association of Teachers he warned of the dangers of having a profession, some of whose members had been to university and some of whom had not. *Journal of Education* 1 Jul 1887. Myers suggests that the emphasis by the EIS on professional standards and objectives rather than on working conditions was essentially a device to keep the profession unified (Myers (1983) p 88) and in the 1840s the institution of the Queen's Scholarship for certain teacher trainees had been seen as a possibly potent divider. Cruikshank (1970) p 56.
108. Fitch (1876) pp 102-3.

109. Graduation did not automatically follow from university attendance. Until the late nineteenth century it was far from usual in Scotland for university students to complete the full graduation course and many teachers, though attending university classes while undergoing teacher-training, never actually took the MA.
110. Boyd, a distinguished Honours graduate and a master in a leading Glasgow secondary school, recalls how a friend from his schooldays who was "doing well in business" asked him his job. "I'm a teacher," he replied. "A *teacher?*" he answered, Boyd recalls, "with a contempt which I remember to this day". Boyd Autob p 233.
111. Sir John Adams at the Second Congress of the Universities of the Empire 1921. *Proceedings* p 268. "The Arts Faculties of the Scotch Universities begin to find themselves more and more dependent for their very existence on the supply of students who are definitely being prepared to be teachers".
112. Anderson (1983) pp 326-7.
113. The Free Church in particular had been opposed to the establishment of such residential colleges in Scotland, abhorring their "monastic, or hospital character, crowding the persons under discipline into one artificial household ... and subjecting them to one uniform martinet domiciliary routine". *Report of the Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland 1849* p 259.
114. *School World* Oct 1910. Significantly the EIS campaign for university involvement had concerned itself entirely with status and qualifications and the actual experience of university life seems to have been of lesser importance. The Institute's Committee on university reform, reporting in 1887, had recommended more recognition of extra-mural teaching and a system of university courses in provincial centres. *Educational News* 14 Jan 1888.
115. *Student* 17 Nov 1911. "Society looks upon the clergyman, the doctor and the lawyer as gentlemen; society classes the school teacher with the mercantile clerk, or sometimes with the dustman ... We see men today in our universities, men who seem oblivious of the fact that they are qualifying for social ostracism."
116. His involvement is not absolutely conclusive. His other writings at the time showed little evidence of direct concern with schooling but more with art and journalism. Moreover, such concern with the teacher's social status is hardly a typical Neill issue.
117. *Alma Mater* 8 Jun 1934.
118. *Student* 9 Mar 1937.
119. *Saltire* 15 Nov 1950.
120. Peddie (1926) Appendix C p 1.

121. He accepted that "the existing training centres will be for ever a state necessity. To them the country must look for the supply of the vast majority of teachers - men and women". Laurie (1899) p 22.
122. Tropp (1957) p 116.
123. Bibby (1961) p 246.
124. Laurie (1892).
125. BQ interview with Rusk.
126. Wood (1953) notes that the Principal of University College, Nottingham welcomed the disappearance of the non-graduating courses for (mainly) elementary teachers from the Nottingham curriculum. The disappearance of the two year course in 1933 met with his "vigorous, even vehement approval" p 112.
127. McNair p 141.
128. Gibson (1912) p 138.
129. Brubacher (1947) p 519.
130. See chapter 6 below.
131. See chapter 5 below.
132. Larson (1977) p 184.
133. Boyd was as enthusiastic (initially at any rate) about his work as a teacher trades unionist as about his work as an academic and seems to have seen the two as linked (Boyd Autob p 236). In America, Stinnett and Huggett (1956) p 54 clearly saw the inauguration of educational studies as *establishing* the profession as a profession rather than as an adornment of it.
134. *Schoolmaster* 26 Sep 1874. This article was actually reacting to events in Scotland surrounding the Chair proposal.
135. *School World* Dec 1905.
136. *New Dominie* Easter 1936.
137. Boyd (1923) p 13.
138. Wilensky (1964) pp 138-158.
139. Always seen, in status terms, as the equivalent of the General Medical Council.
140. Aber G C 19 Oct 1935.
141. Tropp (1957) suggests that in England and Wales this was a direct result of Morant's policy (p 243), thus demonstrating the remarkable pursuit of quite different policies in the two parts of an

ostensibly unitary state.

142. Hamilton (1981).

143. See below Chapter 9.

144. Smith (1913) p 155.

145. Ozga and Lawn (1981) p vi.

146. Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) p 251.

CHAPTER 2

FOUNDING THE SCOTTISH CHAIRS

"There is another art, however, to which knowledge of the intellectual and moral nature of man is still important – that noble art which has the charge of training the ignorance and imbecility of infancy into all the virtue and power and wisdom of maturer manhood – of forming, of a creature, the frailest and feeblest perhaps which heaven has made, the intelligent and fearless sovereign of the whole animated creation, the interpreter and adorer, and almost the representative of the Divinity. The art which performs a transformation so wondrous cannot but be admirable in itself and it is from observation of the laws of mind, that all which is most admirable in it is derived..." Thomas Brown, *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* 1820¹

Dugald Stewart's successor in the chair of Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh was speaking of an area of intellectual enquiry and philosophical specialism already exciting serious academics throughout Northern Europe but still of only marginal concern to the scholars and especially the universities of the British Isles.

In the Scotland of the 1820s there were, however, already a number of voices advocating not merely organised teacher education but the actual study of pedagogical issues within the university curriculum. The most assiduous of these (and a campaigner for the next fifty years) actually had his professional base in Ireland. Despite this his major influence was probably felt in Scotland where his connections with both the established church and, later, with the Educational Institute were very strong.

R.G. Bryce was the Principal of Belfast Academy and although his first major published work was his *Sketch of a Plan for a System of National Education for Ireland* (1828) its title had the significant addendum – *including Hints for the Improvement of Education in Scotland*. Certainly Bryce's views received great currency in the latter country and when, eventually, his campaign for university studies in education met with Scottish success in the St. Andrews and Edinburgh of the 1870s, he felt himself an obvious candidate for the latter chair. In what subsequently turned out to be the false dawn of 1875, when it appeared that the government would actually back and

partially finance the chairs' establishment, Bryce submitted to the Home Secretary a copious book of testimonials, proving, he claimed, that he was "ready to enter on the work of the Chair at any moment, as I have a complete course of lectures prepared, which I have delivered, entire or in sections, to audiences comprising...men of great eminence in Science and literature."²

He had indeed delivered whole courses of lectures on the science of pedagogy in most of the major cities of Ireland and Scotland over a period of more than forty years and his referees for the Edinburgh chair included a wide range of figures from Orpen, the Irish Pestalozzi enthusiast, through Archbishop Whateley and General Burgoyne to the leading lights of the Scottish Educational Institute. He was even able to cite, posthumously, the commendations of Brougham, not only the designer of what was to become University College, London but a political realist who had for long pressed for the proper recognition of pedagogical training by the Exchequer. His colleagues in the movement were therefore eminently level-headed and respectable and, as the *Education Times* pointed out, the scheme was not "some crotchet of a crazed enthusiast".³

The case for teacher training as such was of course widely accepted in Scotland from the 1820s onwards. Indeed, Scottish infant training schools, especially those of Stow in Glasgow were soon influential not only in Britain but throughout Europe and North America. Their relatively progressive view of the small child accorded well with contemporary social movements for child protection and gave direction to the widespread development of Scottish infant and elementary schools under the auspices of the churches, the charities and industrial firms.

Moreover, when from the 30s onwards, the government increased its direct investment in elementary schooling and established, in Ireland, the first British system of national education, its major interest was to avoid the wasting of investment and it was widely recognised that in those foreign systems of national education usually

held up as models, (the Prussian system in particular), organised pedagogical training formed a major ingredient. Moreover, in Prussia there was already an efficient system of secondary schools and higher elementary classes, the complete absence of which in most parts of Britain, made it all the more necessary to provide in the teacher training establishments not only technical training but personal education and an opportunity for both physical and psychological maturation.

Eventually, in England, such aims led Kay-Shuttleworth and others into founding residential colleges which insulated students from their home environment. In Scotland, such initiatives, as we have seen, ran counter to educational tradition. Institutional living there was seen to be as positive a danger to personal morals and character as it was seen to be a positive aid within the English tradition. Even when Scottish students had to travel some distance to attend Normal Schools in Glasgow or Edinburgh it was felt safer by the ecclesiastical authorities to lodge them within church-attending families than in common halls with none but fellow adolescents, while the myth that the average Scottish schoolmaster had usually attended university may well have obscured, at least in the first half of the nineteenth century, the need to provide a better general education for the profession in general.

However, what *was* recognised by many in Scotland from the 1820s onwards was the need for better and more widespread pedagogical training. In an editorial of the 7th January, 1829, for example, the *Scotsman* suggested that the comparative success of the Sessional schools in the Scottish cities may have lain not so much in the personal qualities of the teachers as in the fact that those teachers had studied teaching as an art and that such acquired skills could well be of equal value in the country's parochial schools and among the traditional schoolmasters. Indeed, the value of such training was already being demonstrated by the wide adoption of the Sessional Schools' procedures and products in towns outwith Scotland.⁴

The same editorial advocated the appointment of "Professors" in the art, though

there is no evidence that that word was being used in its restricted modern sense of holders of university chairs. Even so, during the next forty years, such a demand became more than one merely for instruction in the tricks of a fairly basic trade; it came to be linked to the wider international drive for the development of a more humane and effective pedagogy and, indeed, of a *science* of education worthy of university study.

Half a century after Bryce's first public statements on the matter, at the British Association's meeting in Belfast in August 1874 a Mrs Grey justifiably reminded her audience that the British public could not be expected to take the science of education seriously as long as the British universities did not;⁵ to which, of course, the universities could have retorted that they could not be expected to include a subject in their canon and to incur expenditure on it unless it was generally adjudged to be a worthy subject of study and unless students were promised and public or private funds were forthcoming for its proper establishment. Yet, as Mrs Grey admitted, the science of education, even in the 1870s after decades of exhortation by Bryce and others and despite immense continental interest, was still in Britain "little thought of or contemptuously ignored".

Bryce believed that full academic recognition of the need to examine and teach educational issues would not come until the British national systems of education themselves embraced all social classes and until proper training and professional study were demanded of candidates not merely for elementary schools but also for more exalted posts, for example, in the Scottish parochial and burgh schools and the new and thriving Scottish private school sector exemplified in the Edinburgh Academy.⁶ In other words he postulated a Scottish situation that was not even achieved 140 years later with the founding of the General Teaching Council whose remit even now runs only within the Primary and Secondary sectors of the state system itself.

He noted how "the profession of a surgeon was identified with that of a barber, till surgeons began to be men of science" and though, unlike most of his fellow enthusiasts, he was always cautious in his use of German models ("I long ago satisfied myself that the value of the Prussian system of education has been prodigiously exaggerated by the pedantry of travelled men") he nevertheless admired the way in which even that system, "characteristically despotic in its nature and involving a great blunder in political economy", was "yet founded on the sound principle" of an adequate university-based form of teacher-training, a teacher-training even demanded in Prussia even of the clergy,⁷ who in England enjoyed social status through mere ordination "and needed no science to elevate them".

Such elevation was still to be attained by British teachers, however, and in 1839 the English Central Society of Education were to award prizes for essays on "the Expediency and Means of Elevating the Profession of the Educator in Society". In the five essays eventually published a constant theme of the academically distinguished authors was the failure to impose serious academic study of its own tasks on the profession. However, the principal winner, Lalor, of Trinity College, Dublin, while seeing a solution in the establishment of an Education Faculty within the university, was highly pessimistic about such possibilities amid "the present unsettled state and rank of education". He felt that aspirants to teaching posts outside the Public Schools would undoubtedly be patronised - at least in the English and Irish universities - by dons and other students alike, while they might well become "butts for the discharge of those shafts of wit and ridicule which every generation of young people points at the heads of its teachers...Neither (was) it likely that the governing authorities of the universities would regard the plan with any cordiality. They (were) not favourable to improvements loudly demanded by the popular voice and which would even make their own machinery move more smoothly; to join in the uphill work of raising this important profession in public education, to abandon the soft luxury of their easy seats, fling aside their loose robes of colloquial indolence, and descend girt and armed

to a difficult battle for high but neglected interests of society, would be a Quixotism rather foreign to their tastes."⁸

On the other hand, one can legitimately doubt that Lalor's fears were equally valid in Scotland where such patronising was less likely in the universities of 1839 than it was to become a century or even fifty years later and where curriculum development in an essentially market economy was a continuously live issue. In 1831, the Edinburgh professor Leslie, for example, happily sought financing from a wealthy patron for a chair in the Theory and Operation of Commerce (hardly a likely subject in contemporary Oxford or Cambridge) confident not only that Glasgow would follow the lead but that it "could be made a delightful class, crowded by students of all ranks, from boys to young lawyers and great proprietors..."⁹ and in a later Session Address (1874) Principal Grant of Edinburgh was to emphasise the continually commercial concern that a university like his must show, for example over student numbers, so long as the average annual income from a student in the already well endowed ancient universities of England and Ireland was as much as £200 while that in Edinburgh was a mere £12.¹⁰ The Scottish University Commission of 1826 had itself been prompted by a dispute over the establishment of a new chair in midwifery that was felt to be commercially promising and in the fifty years that followed, members of Senate and of the Edinburgh learned community generally continually made suggestions (often successfully) for additions to the professoriate that were likely to attract outside investment or to increase income from student fees. There might well therefore have been a greater general expectation in Scotland than in England that the continued pressure for the establishment of an Education Chair and/or Faculty would eventually succeed if only because of its commercial attractions.

The delay in a Scottish response was even more surprising, perhaps, in view of the wider recognition within Scotland of the academic development of this field elsewhere in Europe. We have already noted Thomas Brown's belief that philosophy should move in this direction while among Lalor's fellow prize-winners was the

Edinburgh advocate James Simpson whose *Philosophy of Education* of 1820 had a wide circulation both in and outside Scotland. Bryce, giving evidence in the 30s to a parliamentary committee ostensibly investigating the state of education in England and Wales, had gone out of his way to emphasise that his "beau ideal" of a training establishment was "a Scotch or German university in which there is a professor of the art and science of education and attached to which there is a school conducted on the principles which the professor expounds in his lectures. Such a school would do the same thing for the student of the art of teaching that a hospital does for students in medicine".¹¹

Remarkably, Bryce was holding up for English emulation a Scotch school of education that had still not come into existence, so confident was he that its achievement there was easy and merely a matter of time. In particular, his confidence in the medical parallel, rightly thought to be a potent one in Scotland, had clearly but understandably led him astray and, indeed, the eventual holders of the Chairs were often to refer to practice schools as their "clinical wards".

Bryce and Simpson, however, were not alone in their advocacy of university involvement. There were advocates within the Scottish universities themselves with whom Bryce interacted,¹² and the most distinguished of whom was Pillans, Professor of Humanity in Edinburgh. Pillans had been Rector of the Edinburgh High School and on taking up his chair, continued not merely to interest himself in matters of schooling but, by reading the latest foreign authors, to build his own experiences into a coherent body of theory that was related to current developments elsewhere. He had earned a reputation as a humane and innovative headmaster, adopting some of the organisational ideas of Bell and Lancaster,¹³ and, in a remarkable way, successfully eschewed the corporal punishment that was to remain normal in most Scottish schools for a further one and a half centuries.¹⁴ Already, as a schoolmaster himself, he had begun preaching the doctrine of efficient training at a time (the 1820s) when many of the parish schoolmasters took such suggestions as a reflection on their

competence. In the British Library copy of his *Principles of Elementary Teaching* of 1828, there is an autograph comment by a friend H.C. (Henry Cockburn?) suggesting that there could be "no better proof of the justice of these objections to the prevailing modes of parochial teaching than that my friends, the Schoolmasters, have begun to abuse Pillans, their best friend, for making them".

In the same book Pillans paid great tribute to the available English and Irish training systems, particularly the Kildare St. model school in Dublin.¹⁵ He also became a great admirer of the Irish National System of 1831¹⁶ and, along with his friend, Lord John Russell, spent his vacations visiting and observing remote village schools.¹⁷ As early as the 1830s, he pressed the case for university "lectureships in Didactics" in the *Edinburgh Review*.¹⁸ and in 1835 he delivered a course of lectures on "the proper objects and methods of education to the different orders of society and on the relative utility of classical instruction" which corresponded (given the British context) in an exceptional way to the German fashion of professorial lectures on pedagogy related to the professor's own academic subject.¹⁹ Pillans wrote and lectured extensively, increasingly extolling Prussian models²⁰ and pressing the need for educational studies not merely on the Scottish universities, but on Oxford, Cambridge and Durham.²¹ Eventually, he backed his advocacy with his own money when in 1863 he offered £5,000 (only £1,000 less than the eventual 1876 endowment) for the partial endowment of an Edinburgh chair "for expounding the Theory and Art of Teaching".²² He appealed to the government to augment this with a similar sum but the government minister Lowe refused on the grounds that he did not believe (despite the continental evidence) that there was such a thing as a science of education and the plan foundered.²³

Also influential, in North America as well as in Scotland, as an advocate of Scottish university studies in education, was the phrenologist, Combe, from whose estate funds were provided for the endowment of the laboratory in Edinburgh which was eventually to form the base for those pioneering studies in psychology that considerably

enhanced the reputation of Scottish educational studies in the early twentieth century. Combe's contribution to the debate was particularly noteworthy for emphasising the savings in building costs that could be achieved by concentrating pedagogical training in the universities.²⁴

More widely based than such a group of enthusiastic individuals, however, was that creation of the 1840s, the Educational Institute which immediately identified itself plainly with the movement that Bryce and Pillans led. From its inception, as Belford its historian makes clear, the Institute advocated that a Faculty of Education, presided over by a Professor of Education, should be set up in each Scottish university,²⁵ providing not merely their general education but their actual professional training, though in the very early days, judging from the Institute's Constitution it may even be that some had thought of turning the Institute itself, with its President and Fellows, into a teaching body of equal rank with a body of Scottish universities that in mid nineteenth century awarded few degrees and was mainly concerned with delivering lecture courses and issuing class tickets. In such a way it could have eschewed its later trades union role and become a Scottish equivalent of the English College of Preceptors, which was founded at much the same time.²⁶

In the event, the accession of the EIS to the movement for the establishment of university Education Chairs did much to complicate the issue. Its own development was not an easy one. It had been created so soon after the Disruption of the Kirk in 1843 that the growing and increasingly bitter religious dissensions of Scotland were reflected in its membership, especially once the Free Church began to establish its own rival system of parochial and sessional schools. Moreover, the initial enthusiasm for membership in the EIS that had brought together in Scotland the teachers of all social classes and all academic levels (including university professors) was gradually to crumble through the spread of English-style models of schoolmastering as practised in the Edinburgh Academy, while the professoriates of Edinburgh and Glasgow in particular now increasingly saw themselves as part of an all-British

academic profession with high social status and English headquarters rather than as purely Scottish teachers. This process had proceeded sufficiently by the time of the December congress of the Institute in 1874, a congress largely concerned with university matters, for Professor Hodgson, as EIS president, to deplore the complete absence of all professors but himself from their gathering, raising a laugh by suggesting that he intended asking the whole Senate of Edinburgh to enrol immediately,²⁷ and if for the time being most elementary and secondary teachers remained in union, the seeds of eventual further divisions were already being sown.

On the issue of the Education Chairs, despite momentary bursts of enthusiasm,²⁸ the impact of the the EIS thus became increasingly weaker. There was continual confusion over whether, when they discussed the university education of teachers, all members were thinking of instruction in the "science of education" or merely attendance at the Arts course for self-development and acquirement of social prestige, while the more denominationally minded, intent on preserving their own churches' teacher training centres often seemed to see the proposed professors as symbolic, ceremonial figures establishing a bridgehead in the prestigious, professional halls of the university, sitting on public committees, presenting prizes at school speech days, writing books, but never presiding over or interfering with the major forms of professional technical training, that must remain firmly in church hands.²⁹ Each of the two main churches had major training establishments in both Glasgow and Edinburgh and in the 1870s were to set up similar establishments in Aberdeen, thus forming an influential and expanding empire that could not easily be abandoned.

In the event, the most important EIS impact on the chairs issue probably came not from its presidents or its central committees but from one of its branches in a highly peripheral Highland area through the involvement in the affairs of that branch of one particular enthusiast, William Jolly.

Jolly was Her Majesty's Inspector for some of the most northerly counties of

Scotland and was based in Inverness. Moreover, his continued advocacy of university based training and the establishment of Chairs of Education during the 60s and early 70s appears, from the Blue Book accounts, to have particularly irritated some of his own most influential colleagues in the inspectorate. In his Report for 1874, for example, Kerr completely rejects any Chair related to elementary teaching³⁰ and in that for 1875³¹ Ross claims that he "cannot see by what machinery the practical department of the work of the teacher of method can be attached to any university chair". Yet they were among those most sympathetic to Jolly, believing that the Chair might have a relevance to secondary schools. On the other hand, in his 1873 Report, Ogilvie claimed that "the art of teaching like the gift of poetry is so much of a heaven-born art that I venture to affirm ... that, given the requisite knowledge, the student who cannot learn the method of imparting it in from 3 to 6 months is not likely to learn it at all."³²

Even so, the support of Bryce and S.S. Laurie, who, as Inspector of the Dick Bequest, was much involved in improving the standards of teaching and teacher education Jolly's own area, helped to establish his national position and his speeches and articles soon gained currency not merely in the London reviews but in the English educational press³³ and policy statements supportive of Jolly in numerous EIS resolutions during the 50s and 60s made it impossible for the chairs' opponents, notably concentrated in the West of Scotland, to oppose his views effectively within the Institute itself.

Jolly's views were wide-ranging for he did not, as so many teachers appeared to do, merely see in the establishment of Chairs a search for professional prestige as an end in itself. He made a systematic study of continental systems and, in his articles, described complex proposals for integrating the study of the Arts curriculum (including newly established Education courses) with attendance at a teacher training schedule based on a "clinical" practice school. It was indeed a major programme for establishing an all-embracing system of teacher training for all classes of teachers

entirely within the university sector and in September 1873 his plan received its final major fillip from the acceptance by the EIS annual general meeting in Glasgow of a resolution (compiled by Jolly himself?) in the name of the Northern Counties branches.

This resolution received considerable publicity and in the next month was a subject of major public discussion in England at the widely reported Social Science Congress in Norwich which was addressed at length by the EIS president (and professor) Hodgson.³⁴ Moreover, it received a warm welcome from the Editor of the *Scotsman* who felt that the Institute's new emphasis on chairs, teaching standards and academic ambition would win back the approval and goodwill of a public tired of teachers' habitual complaining.

"They could not have a better cause, not only for rallying round them the whole teaching profession but also for enlisting a large measure of public sympathy. They may proclaim their wrongs from John O' Groats to Kirkmaiden and no man listen; but if they come forward as the advocates of higher professional training, they will have the country at their back."³⁵

This article nevertheless seemed to be more concerned with teacher standards than with the academic development of educational studies as such and the whole campaign from the 1820s onwards tended to confuse the two issues for the sympathetic reader. In a *Museum* article of 1862,³⁶ for example, an anonymous "Edinburgh Graduate" (now generally believed to be Laurie, the eventual first holder of the Edinburgh chair) described a plan, the exposition of which some later writers have taken to be a turning point in the campaign for the chairs. This particular plan was as much a plan for a reform of Scottish teachers' general education and their wider induction to university style studies as for the institution of the widespread university study of Education as such, though it does suggest adding to the Faculty of Arts a Chair of the Principles and Practice of Teaching, connected to a model school *outside* the university,³⁷ an idea taken up by Donaldson, the future Principal of St. Andrews, in another *Museum* article two years later strongly advocating chairs of Education, and

suggesting that if Pillans' pupils "raise any memorial to his memory, it will be in the shape of a chair of Didactics."³⁸ Jolly's campaign was equally specific on the desirability of Chairs and training *within* the university and carried with it a threat of consequences for the existing denominational teacher training system that were soon perfectly clear to his opponents in Glasgow. They were also clear to the remainder of the inspectorate and ultimately to the Scotch Education Department who had the elementary teachers' training establishments firmly under their financial and curricular control.

The Northern Counties resolution and its reception made a great impact particularly in the East of Scotland and helped to create a new climate of opinion among a widening range of academics. Glasgow suggests it began for the first time "an active movement"³⁹ but in the event, the actual culmination of fifty years' talk of university education studies came about through another and quite unexpected circumstance, the sudden decision in 1873 by the executors of the Reverend Andrew Bell, the originator of the famous monitorial system, to offer Edinburgh University the endowment of a Chair in the Theory, History and Practice of Education.

The EIS had responded to the Northern Memorial (presented by Jolly) by appointing a Chair Committee, intended to rouse the profession and "to obtain subscriptions for the establishment of Chairs in the Scottish universities",⁴⁰ thus showing their determination to avoid the failure that had attended their earlier, half-hearted attempts to establish university studies in Education - in 1870, for example, when their President had asked himself why they could not at least set up a "*lectureship* in connection with the universities in the science and art of education" and regretted the lack of support that Pillans had received.⁴¹ Yet, as Glasgow makes clear, this new Chair Committee "had no sooner begun to make arrangements than the Bell Trustees came forward".⁴²

The links between the Bell money and the Scottish universities had always been

potentially close. It was in fact Andrew Bell that the entrepreneurial Edinburgh professor had approached with his suggestion of a Chair in Commerce, while in an *Edinburgh Review* article of 1834, Pillans, renewing a plea for the establishment of lectureships in didactics at each Scottish university, had pleaded for public contributions towards endowments in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen but had assumed that St. Andrews already had "ample powers and funds...for such an object under the settlement and bequest of the late Dr Bell".⁴³

In fact Pillans, as usual, was overoptimistic about the financial situation and certainly for the next forty years the Executors of Dr Bell took no action in the matter. Why they eventually did take such action is still far from totally clear. By 1873 the executors numbered three - Lord Leven, his son Lord Kirkcaldie and J. Cook W.S. but it seems clear from Cook's own evidence to the Endowed Schools Commission that the initial decision to devote £6,000 to the endowment of an Edinburgh Chair of Education was largely his own⁴⁴ and that he persuaded his two colleagues to agree by letter without any face to face discussion of the matter. Cook seems to have had no significant links with the EIS or any of the leading public campaigners such as Bryce or Jolly though, within the confines of Edinburgh professional and ecclesiastical life, he may well have been influenced by Laurie, Hodgson, Principal Grant or any number of sympathisers with such a project and, as Factor of the University,⁴⁵ he was clearly interested in the possible financial advantages that might accrue. On the other hand, his decision may well have represented merely a common-sense personal reaction to current press discussion of the issue - in relation to the Northern Counties resolution, for example - and in the terms of his commission he "interpreted (his task) in the circumstances" of 1873, as enjoined by Bell's will.

Bell, who had been born and educated in St. Andrews and had ended his career as a canon of Westminster, amassed an enormous fortune during his lifetime largely as a result of the widespread adoption and popularity of his monitorial schemes and had dispersed a considerable portion of this before his death by founding schools, in

particular Madras College in St. Andrews which was designed to be a showcase of his educational methods. He had also financed, during his lifetime, a series of lectures in Edinburgh, ten of which were to be on "the principles of education"⁴⁶ lectures which, Knox suggests,⁴⁷ may have suggested the notion of using Bell money for the financing of the Edinburgh chair. Among his legacies there was a "residue" which, as Cook told the commissioners, he left "in a peculiar way". This "residue" was to be applied to the maintaining, carrying forward and following up of the system of education which (to quote Cook again) "he considered to have been introduced by him - according to circumstances and occasion and the existing state of things".

Bell had himself recognised that there might be flaws in his system and possible scope for improvements, "I therefore give to my said trustees and executors", he went on, "in whom I have implicit confidence, ample power to interpret this my will in the most liberal manner consistent with my views and objects, assumed that they will in all things endeavour to carry my intention, however imperfectly expressed, into full effect and I exempt them from liability or responsibility to any legal, equitable or other jurisdiction or trial..."

Initially much of the legacy had gone into establishing schools all over Scotland, especially in remoter areas, but there remained an accumulation of £18,000 and from this the executors decided to establish the Edinburgh Chair.⁴⁸ In November 1873 the Trustees (hoping for parliamentary sanction) approached the Royal Commission on the Endowed Schools and Hospitals of Scotland with their proposals and the only hint Cook gave in his evidence of the reasons for the timing of this particular, unexpected gift was to relate it to the recent passing of the major Education Act in 1872. This had, of course, largely obviated the need for the further endowment of church or charity schools in areas deprived of them, given that the Scottish Act, unlike the English one, had established school boards in *every* part of the country and not merely where they were needed through the failure of voluntary activities. Thus the trustees had seen it worthwhile now that schools were to be generally provided by

the state, to "popularize and extend the educational system of Scotland" in a novel way. "By means of such a chair, the trustees think that the science and practice of education might be taught" and while they hoped that the professor might advert to the Madras system during his lectures "as far as is practicable in the present day", they did not press the point, which was just as well, given the increasing rejection of his schemes. Pillans had tried them and Laurie, as an act of piety, was to pay them some sort of tribute in his inaugural but Bryce had been a principal critic of Bell's methods of organising teaching - "this mere mechanical training, which bears the same relation to a true and rational system of professional education for teachers, that the steam engine of the Marquess of Worcester bears to the steam engine of Watt"⁴⁹ and Bell was also scorned by many other influential Scots of the time, such as Cockburn, who saw his Madras College as, "like everything else connected with (its) founder ... inharmonious, contemptible".⁵⁰

As a personal afterthought, Cook expressed a hope that the professor could "devote a little attention to the matter of elocution" and that this would eventually bear some fruit in "the pulpit" as much as among pupils, knowing, as he did, that there was always professional movement between the ministry and the teaching profession in both directions, but that suggestion also seems to have been ignored by the eventual incumbents.

One matter that *had* carried weight with Cook was the Section of the Code allowing certain teachers to qualify for state recognition simply by attendance at university and he hoped that the provision of a Chair in Pedagogy would mean that though they had never attended a Normal School like the mass of new teachers, they would nevertheless be exposed to instruction in the art of "their particular calling",⁵¹ while he suggested that Edinburgh had been chosen because of the larger number of suitable schools for teaching practice to be found in the city; and although he agreed that he had had discussions with the Principal before the offer to the university was finally made,⁵² he gave no hint that Grant or anyone else had approached him in the

first place. Nor does the Senate's eventual reaction to the offer, when it was formally made early in 1874, suggest this.⁵³

In view of the long public campaign with its emphasis on continental practice, it is interesting that Cook in his evidence denied all knowledge of any chairs of pedagogy in other countries except that he believed "that in Berlin the professors of the Faculty are understood to teach pedagogy as part of the course of philosophy".

It does appear therefore that his decision was in many senses independent of the campaign as such and, indeed, was made in ignorance of at least some of the arguments recently rehearsed widely in the Scottish press. It appears also to have been made by someone remarkably unaware of the political storms to which his decision would soon give rise. Indeed, one of his questioners at the Endowed Schools Commission actually asked how the professor would "instruct in teaching" and provoked from Cook, the politically naive suggestion in terms of current controversy, that he could take part in the teaching of a local Normal School, i.e. the very sector from which most of the opposition to the Bell chair was expected to come.

In fact the Normal Schools were divided on the issue. Ross, head of the Established Church establishment in Glasgow was one of the keenest advocates of the Chairs and was to publish a short but influential book on the subject⁵⁴ while the Free Church Principal in Glasgow showed considerable resentment of the notion that such centres as his neglected the new science and its authors.⁵⁵ But those of their supporters who eventually saw or began to see in the proposed chair a possible rival (and a secular rival at that) were temporarily taken by surprise when the Bell trustees' sudden offer to Edinburgh was made. They had seen in the Northern Counties Resolution merely another display of rhetoric. The many previous attempts at action by the EIS had all failed; Bryce had been fruitlessly preaching such doctrines for nearly fifty years. Even Pillans' offer, backed by substantial cash, had come to nothing and,

furthermore, he had had scorn poured upon him by Whitehall itself, while Jolly had not only been rebuked by many of his fellow inspectors (who had largely rallied to the defence of the Normal Schools in their disputes with him) but had even become a figure of fun in influential quarters. The *Glasgow Herald* had described him, with: "Fire in each eye and papers in each hand. He raves, recites and maddens round the land' about whatever hobbies have enlisted his head and his heart. The chief of these are or used to be, education chairs and school handkerchiefs. (According to Mr Jolly) Scotland was to be made to stand where it did by dry noses and instruction in paedutics..."⁵⁶

Now Jolly's hitherto confident opponents were suddenly faced with a situation in which a concrete financial offer was being made to one of the two major universities and seemed likely to be accepted. When it was announced a few weeks later that St. Andrews had also been made an offer by the Bell trustees, the situation seemed even more serious. In the St. Andrews case, not only had the university authorities themselves approached the Bell trustees, seeing in the possible Chair a real financial hope for a university whose student body had fallen below the 300 mark but they had subsequently received encouragement from the Scotch Education Department to develop a full-blown plan for general teacher training, given that there was no training centre situated there which it could rival. Even more significantly, Edinburgh and St. Andrews had been asked by government to convene a meeting of all four universities to submit a national plan for teacher training within the university sector,⁵⁷ that was obviously aimed at the as yet untrained graduate teachers.

The moves by the Bell trustees and their client universities had given considerable encouragement to a number of current English developments even more likely to impress government and to make the adoption of the Scottish Universities' scheme within the Scotch Code a likely proposition. In London the recently established College of Preceptors had been the main vehicle for attempting to improve the status of middle rank teachers by the encouragement of academically based training. Its

lecture courses, particularly those of Payne and Meiklejohn (later the first professor at St Andrews), had been both encouraging to and an influence upon the movement in Scotland. At the Norwich Congress in 1873, Hodgson had particularly praised an influential course of Edinburgh lectures given by Payne, the College's chief lecturer.⁵⁸ Now the English College turned to Scotland for its example. Its journal called for a national subscription of £5,000 to establish an actual College *Chair* rather than Lectureship in emulation of Edinburgh.

"What the Scotch have done for a country numerically not much more populous and probably less wealthy than our own metropolis, it ought not to be too much to expect of England."⁵⁹

In fact, of course, the College was counting its Scotch chickens before they were hatched and as it turned out, their English Chair (albeit not in a university) was to be founded before the Scottish ones, thus strengthening the feeling among the Scottish Chairs' enemies and friends alike that the English were now quickly moving towards University teacher training at every level, for at one of their first meetings, in 1872, many members of the newly created Headmasters Conference (of the preeminent Public Schools) had enthusiastically called for the creation of teacher training courses within Oxford and Cambridge themselves not only for their own recruits but for the increasingly large number of non-clergy now seeking posts in grammar and public schools throughout England⁶⁰ and similar requests had been made by the College of Preceptors' deputation to the government minister Forster in 1874. Indeed, the College's newspaper was "absolutely certain" that Oxford and Cambridge would eventually agree.⁶¹ Hitherto teacher training was purely the concern of the elementary schools. Now its net was to be widened. There was therefore increasing anxiety in the Scottish Normal Schools that their Whitehall controllers might no longer be so prepared to protect their inspector-backed monopoly quite as indefinitely as they had expected.

As to why this monopoly seemed so important to the Normal Schools we shall return in a moment but before doing so, it is as well to examine the Scottish universities' own attitudes to the Bell offer as well as to teacher training and to Educational Studies as such, for although Edinburgh and St. Andrews accepted the offer with gratitude and, indeed, in St. Andrews' case had actually solicited it, opinion in neither of those universities was quite as unanimous or straightforward as it appeared and while in Aberdeen there seems to have been a willingness to follow the Edinburgh/St. Andrews example if the money were forthcoming, in Glasgow opinions were certainly mixed, for the major opposition in Scotland to the Bell chairs was actually centred on Clydeside and to some extent appear to have been led by university figures.

Naturally in all four universities there was some awareness of the untapped market potential among teacher recruits, whether through increased admissions to the Arts course or through the provision of teacher training as such.⁶² The scheme based on the Bell offer originally envisaged the attraction of 100 students per year to Edinburgh and 20 or 30 to St. Andrews⁶³ and in the former case there was an obvious financial advantage in straight fee terms if even more teachers chose to attend University alongside attendance in Normal Schools.⁶⁴ The establishment of these teacher-training centres had in itself led to a falling away in university attendance on the part of potential teachers, especially in St. Andrews. Whether the attraction of more students could be achieved merely by making the Arts courses more financially accessible (by way of scholarships) or whether it was necessary to provide the extra bait of teacher-training within the university remained a question for debate. Many thought that a Chair of Education *would* be an added incentive and an especial attraction to those secondary teachers who for reasons of social class would be unattracted to the Normal School itself.⁶⁵ Certainly, all four universities thought it worthwhile eventually to subscribe to a joint plan for teacher training and this was eventually forwarded to the Privy Council Office in the course of the public dispute over the chairs.

There was in any case a general feeling that in the post-1872 period the universities *were* called upon to take new initiatives not only with regard to teacher training in the narrow sense (a potential university concern envisaged in the Act) but also in the far wider sense of improving the general educational level of Scottish teachers, both for the sake of the country as a whole and in order to improve the standard of the universities' own entrants. Indeed in 1873 formal government approval had been given to the concurrent attendance at university of Training Centre students. There was thus a general feeling that since 1872 Scotland had moved into a new educational atmosphere and unlike the church-run Normal Schools, the universities were now officially non-denominational, indeed secular institutions which could respond to and serve more readily the newly secularised school system. There seemed a reasonable prospect of a general improvement in school and thus of university standards if the school boards really did begin to carry out the full duties prescribed for them, and this would be considerably assisted if the "traditional" intellectual levels of the parish schoolmasters could be revived or maintained. For all these reasons, perhaps, the *Scotsman* reviewer of the 1874 reissue of Laurie's *Primary Instruction* of 1867 could already say that the first edition had been published in "quite a remote period so far as educational questions are concerned".⁶⁶

St. Andrews, the university most fraught with financial problems, felt particularly challenged by the post-1872 atmosphere and opportunities. As Principal Shairp described it, "When, by the recent Education Act, a revolution was being made in the primary as well as some of the secondary schools of this country it seemed to this University that the fitting time for moving in this matter had arrived. With this view a Committee was appointed... (at the end of 1872) to consider a report on the training of Schoolmasters in the Universities."⁶⁷ This report led to much negotiation with and encouragement from London. And a similar spirit of responding to a new situation pervaded the early Senate discussions of the Bell offer in Edinburgh which seemed to answer a call, however vague, for action in relation to the schools even by those

universities not in St. Andrews' acute financial difficulties.⁶⁸ As we noted already, this alertness had been heightened by the possibility of university-based training being specifically mentioned in the Act though as later newspaper controversies made clear, the interpretation of that clause and its possible translation into the provisions of the Scotch Code remained complex matters to say the least.

Insofar as the actual chair suggestion and the academic development of a "science of education" were concerned, enthusiasm was probably less general. Those professors ready to follow prestigious English developments were no doubt impressed by the Headmasters Conference Resolutions and the moves being made in Oxford and Cambridge to satisfy their needs,⁶⁹ and certainly there were those who, like Hodgson, were Jolly's enthusiastic disciples. Others were no doubt keen also that Scotland should follow what was a growing, academically respectable fashion for pedagogical studies on the continent and probably some of the most influential, though more cautious, were, like Principal Grant, addressing the Social Science Congress in Glasgow in 1874, "much gratified" that his university was to be the first in Britain to be endowed with such a chair.⁷⁰

At the same time, given that scepticism about the value of Educational Studies is still far from over even in the British universities of the 1980s it would be surprising not to detect some scepticism about "a science of education" and even more about the "plebeian" practice of teacher-training in the Scottish universities of the 1870s. Macdonald, Professor of History at Aberdeen, for example, told a president of the EIS in the 70s "with easy derision", that he had "no faith in teacher-making chairs",⁷¹ while even the supportive Grant, who by late 1875 had been converted to the notion that it was quite as natural to have a chair of the Practice of Teaching as a Chair of the Practice of Physic",⁷² had in his equivalent Sessional address a year earlier found the new Chair an easy source of light relief among his student audience. "Such a chair will be a novelty in this country, though courses on what they call "Pedagogik" (laughter and a voice 'Spell it!' and renewed laughter)⁷³ have long been given in the

Universities of Germany,"⁷⁴ he acknowledged, though the tone was still not one of total conviction.

Moreover, like most even of his sympathetic colleagues, even like Bryce, Grant continually comforted himself in public with the ethno-centric assumption that the new Scottish professors would actually be the first ever to have attempted the compilation of any integrated science of education, again lightheartedly suggesting on at least two occasions that it would be their *duty* to be the science's very first synthesisers. "It will doubtless be a very useful thing to have all the views and theories of education from Plato to Pestalozzi, from the Laws of Lycurgus to the last New Revised Code brought together and, as much as may be, reduced to scientific form by a Professor of ability".⁷⁵

There was in the air also, a genuine feeling on the part of some Scots that the universities could contribute *new* ideas to this area of philosophy and science as Brown had forecast. Throughout the 60s and 70s there had always been enthusiastic audiences for speakers on such topics in the Scottish cities and the British Association meetings of the Social Science Congresses always now included specifically educational sessions in their programmes. The EIS could always rely on professors not obviously related to education, who were willing to address them like Laycock in November 1874, on such topics as "Psychology applied to Education as an Art" and it is also interesting to note that throughout the two years of suspense between the Bell offer and the final establishment of the two chairs the one generally accepted sentiment, even on the part of Scottish opponents of the Chairs, was that the maximum number of teachers must be exposed to a new intellectual and cultural stimulus or preferably university experience not so much or merely because this would increase professors' incomes (this did not always happen) but because in some way this was seen to be part of a national tradition that must not be lost. The search for an adequate intellectual airing of the teachers' peculiar professional concerns gained at least some strength from this impulse.

The tradition of the Scottish teacher intellectual was, as we have said, a tradition that had been grossly overplayed, not least by Bryce; and some inspectors in particular were anxious to emphasise both its historical and current unreality⁷⁶ but it was to play an important role in developing those schemes of concurrent attendance at both University and Normal School which continued to flourish and spread even as the work and significance of the Chairs began to diminish and decline, so that by the 1920s the idea of an all graduate male teaching profession seemed as naturally desirable and feasible in Scotland as it still seemed impossibly remote in England. Insofar as the celebration of intellectual activity and university experience as a means of raising the teacher's social status was the mainspring of Bryce's argument for Chairs of Pedagogy, then his campaign had a far more far-reaching effect than the implementation of the Bell offer and its consequences.

A remarkable number of standard secondary sources see the story of the foundation of the Education Chairs as actually being at an end with that Bell offer itself. Cruickshank in her history of Scottish teacher-training refers in vague terms to the fact that "there appears to have been some possibility of an extra government subsidy",⁷⁷ while others either get the sum wrong or assume it was entirely donated by government.⁷⁸ In fact no money came from government at all. Indeed for eighteen months the two universities vainly attempted to obtain such a Whitehall augmentation of the Bell endowment and in the event those months of waiting were to be crucial in the eventual shaping of the scope and work of the two Chairs in the century to follow, for whereas Cook's offer had taken the Chairs' opponents by surprise, the ensuing months of lobbying gave them a considerable opportunity to marshal their arguments and counter-attack and to diminish the impact of the actual foundation.

Indeed, Bryce, Jolly and their supporters were to be taken aback by the strength of the opposition. Much of the journalist comment favouring the chairs had too readily assumed that the rightness of the cause was self-evident and that all would wish such an apparently laudable venture well, while those papers which were sceptical, in

particular the *Glasgow Herald*, instead of attacking the proposal outright adopted the ultimately more effective tactic of apparently ignoring the issue completely, denying the offer any publicity, often even omitting all mention of the chairs from conference and congress reports that were dominated by the subject in the columns of other papers, both Scottish and English.

Another major problem soon proved to be more serious, however, than the apathy or antipathy of the press. Two national groups with great influence and an articulate membership, were now at best lukewarm about and at worst even critical of the Bell trustees' proposals. One was the main body of the Scottish inspectorate, the other was the leadership of the Church of Scotland and Free Church education committees.

At that time each of the regional inspectors contributed to the annual Blue Book his general survey of the educational scene, a survey which embraced not merely the details of his local area - Galloway, Clydeside, the Lothians - but was also allowed by a governmental tradition totally abandoned during the paper shortage of the first World War. to extend into a statement of personal opinion on issues of the day. Indeed, Jolly had for long used his own annual report on the Inverness region to put his pro-chair views before the press and public. The Blue Books for 1874 and 1875 gave his colleagues Wilson, Kerr and Ross a chance to put their own more sceptical views on the issue. Kerr in particular, was quite willing to pursue his argument with the Editor of the *Scotsman* through that paper's correspondence columns in a way that would be inconceivable for a modern civil servant at a time when such an issue was the subject of critical parliamentary debate.⁷⁹

For him the issue facing Scotland was not one of providing teacher-training as such. This was already adequately provided by the Normal Schools. Scotland's problem was one of civilising her teachers and this could be adequately done merely by admitting Normal School students to the university Arts classes without the expensive extra luxury of any Chair of Education. He admitted that such a chair might

be of use to secondary teachers who would otherwise escape training altogether, a view that the *Scotsman* had attacked as an attempt to divide a profession which, through the EIS, had always maintained a remarkable solidarity. Moreover, the Kerr view disturbed the two universities who still saw in the chair plan a chance to develop a profitable market in the actual teacher-training field. Kerr retorted that if that was what they wanted they should incorporate the Normal Schools into their own structure as embryonic Faculties of Education, a solution, of course, that he knew might well disturb hidden elitist feelings, both social and academic, that few save Bryce dared to articulate.

However any such University take-over of Normal Schools was, if anything, even more disturbing to their own proprietors, the two major churches, than the Chair plan itself and this church opposition seems to have had two major origins, one secular, one religious. The first was the now considerable body of pride and vested interest in the church training centres as such.⁸⁰ These made major posts and incomes available for church-oriented teachers in the four large Glasgow and Edinburgh training centres and this church training system was even now in the process of expansion to Aberdeen with further plans for Dundee that seemed particularly threatened by the lively St. Andrews' plan to expand into the general training field and Jolly was sufficiently aware of these fears from 1874 onwards to incorporate into his own speeches on the subject a plea for consultation with the Normal Schools in the planning of the chairs⁸¹ and even before the final outcome, other of the chairs' supporters were ready to concede far more on such issues than was at first envisaged. Significantly, Macdonald chairing an influential EIS congress at the end of 1874, with justification, said he believed the government would ultimately protect the Normal Schools and that in the government's interest in them "the Schools had the best security that nothing would be done to compromise them. He believed there was ample room for a Chair of Education in the Universities and for the existing Normal Schools also."⁸² The universities themselves, particularly Grant, soon began to

talk in similar terms, no doubt to the embarrassment of Jolly and even more of Bryce who always preached the doctrine of a national system undivided on class lines as the only guarantee of a respected teacher professionalism.

At the same Glasgow congress addressed by Macdonald a new acerbity crept into public discussion of the whole issue. One speaker spoke of the "narrowing influences of the present state of training, in that it conduces to professional bigotry by the stamping of the future schoolmaster as a 'dominie' and as nothing else from the beginning to the end of his career"⁸³ and the situation was not helped by the *Scotsman* editorial comment that "the objection taken to these institutions...was not so much that they had come short in the technical part of their duties as that they had failed to foster a high and magnanimous spirit; that they turned out good enough scholastic drill-sergeants but no large-minded, well-informed and cultural men".⁸⁴ Not surprisingly spokesmen for the Normal Schools now began to come out into the open to defend themselves against such charges.

However, what opposition there was to the Chairs within the churches did not depend only or even ultimately on the need to preserve the jobs or the honour of the Normal School staff. An actual religious issue was also involved, for in accepting the 1872 Act and its establishment of an almost totally secular school system with a readiness that was not matched by the leading churches of England or Ireland, the main Presbyterian churches of Scotland had probably placed more dependence than was usually recognised on the fact that almost the entire teacher-training system was to remain in their hands.⁸⁵ In the early years following the settlement, notorious *causes celebres*, in Selkirk and elsewhere, reminded the public that if the religious education of Scottish children was to survive in the new secular schools, then the new school boards, sometimes riven by doctrinal squabbles, could not be relied upon,⁸⁶ and that the only ultimate guarantee of the Christian (and Presbyterian) quality of the teaching profession lay in its church-based training.⁸⁷ Yet some of the chairs' supporters, particularly the *Scotsman*, saw in the Bell offer an opportunity at last to

transfer the teacher-training system for secular schools to the secular sector of higher education, that is to the universities. The original justification for the continuance of denominational teacher-training had been the continued existence of a small number of denominational schools but these were now rapidly disappearing and it seemed to the *Scotsman* appropriate to seize now on the Bell money and the universities' proposed teacher-training scheme as the means of establishing a totally non-denominational education system⁸⁸ and the plausibility of this argument naturally put the churches on their mettle.

The final enemy of the universities, however, was their own divided state. Only two of them had been offered the money (however inadequate) for actual Chairs and in the "united" plan for teacher-training submitted to government by all four universities, Aberdeen and Glasgow (bereft of chairs) were to be in an uncertain partnership with the local denominational training centres; at the same time any material jealousy on the part of Glasgow University at not receiving a Bell offer was now played upon by the many Clydeside forces, both ecclesiastical and political, which opposed the chairs for other reasons. Not surprisingly, therefore, when opposition to the chair scheme revealed itself in Westminster, it was seen to come mainly from the Glasgow direction. In the words of Principal Shairp of St. Andrews, "In this case, the crosswinds that have thwarted, if they have not wrecked, the plans of the universities and hopes of the whole teaching body blew from the west, got up, it is said, by a certain MP potent in that quarter, and acting with certain members of two church committees".⁸⁹ Certainly it was to do considerable damage.

In fact, it had never been obvious that the matter of the chairs must go to Westminster or even to Whitehall at all. At first it had been hoped that the Endowments Commission would settle the whole matter. In any case, a Scottish university was for the moment free to establish whatever chair it liked,⁹⁰ as the Bell trustees had assumed all along. On the other hand, under the 1858 Act any change in the actual curriculum had to be discussed among all four universities themselves and

with the Privy Council, while the St. Andrews-sponsored joint four plan for official teacher-training did, of course, require official sanction before its incorporation in the Scotch Code.

In the event, however, the initial reason for an approach to government had not to do with those latter reasons but with the financing of the Chairs themselves. Indeed, the Edinburgh Senate had never spent much time on the joint four training plan. What it was most concerned with was its own professorial salaries and it was clear that the salary for an Education Chair based on the Bell endowment of £6,000 would not really be adequate.⁹¹

Some members of the Arts Faculty, indeed, suggested abandoning the Chair idea altogether in favour of a less expensive Lectureship⁹² but it was clear from the start that Cook and his colleagues would not accept this, while Jolly had attacked it strongly in the press.⁹³ The Bell trustees pointed out to the Senate that two other recently established chairs, in Engineering and Geology, had had no difficulty in receiving government augmentation to the value of the £200 now required for the Education proposal.⁹⁴ No problem, therefore, seemed likely to arise from an approach to Whitehall. Moreover, there remained in some minds the view of Pillans that once government accepted the university's version of a teaching qualification, the demand for places would in itself rapidly increase this particular chair's profitability and endowment, thus providing yet another reason for also supporting the joint-four approach on teacher-training initiated by St. Andrews and making government fully aware of such plans. Many people both in and out of the universities, especially in the EIS, were looking forward to the rapid establishment not merely of the Chairs but of whole Faculties and their euphoria contributed to the feeling even among the more cautious, that approaches to government for the modest sum of £200 per annum seemed both necessary and almost routine.

However, such a modest process turned out in the end to be a far more complex

and hazardous venture than had ever been envisaged and far too much was being taken for granted. Indeed, both the Principals, Shairp and Grant, in their Inaugural addresses of November 1874 seemed to assume the Bell offer had clinched the matter of the chairs and that merely a few details remained to be arranged. They showed no sign of anticipating the sad stories that were to dominate those same addresses twelve months later.

Some of the complicating factors could not have been foreseen. One was that, in the midst of the negotiations with London, the generally sympathetic Liberal government of Gladstone, influenced by the *Scotsman*, the Universities' own MP Lyon Playfair and several politician Rectors and Chancellors,⁹⁵ was replaced by the Conservative government of Disraeli, influenced far more by Glasgow opinion and in particular by Whitelaw, MP for Glasgow itself, and chairman of the Glasgow School Board, the largest and most powerful in Scotland.⁹⁶

Any approach to Whitehall over Scottish education during the 1870s was in any case complicated by the, by modern standards, impossibly widely spread responsibility for Scottish affairs within a cabinet largely English in orientation. The chair negotiations involved, at various times, the Lord Advocate (who though officially a legal figure was at that time the one specifically Scottish senior member of the government and was therefore deferred to on Scottish affairs by his colleagues), the Home Secretary (the minister of the interior for Scotland), the Lord President of the Council (responsible for the Committee of Council on Education and therefore for the Scotch Education Department) and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as the dispenser of funds. A century later, the Scottish tasks of the Home Secretary and the Lord President have been assumed by the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Lord Advocate has become a purely legal figure and the Chancellor of the Exchequer has become too Olympian to be approached personally about such matters as an extra £200 for a Scottish university chair. As it was, the petitioners and counter-petitioners over the Bell chairs had to approach in person some or all of these office-holders

under two different administrations before the matter was finally resolved to the universities' dissatisfaction.

Moreover, the matter was further complicated by the normal jealousies between actual government departments.⁹⁷ It seems likely that the universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews finally ruined their case by approaching the new Chancellor before they approached the new Lord President whose officials in the Scotch Education Department had then made it their duty to block "educational" promises made illegitimately and prematurely by a Treasury minister; though others, Shairp among them, believed rather that the case had been damaged by the superior skill of the Glasgow opponents of the scheme who had realised from the first that their initial approach should be to the Scotch Education Department with its continuing affection for the Normal Schools.⁹⁸ It may be also that the Lord Advocate had been swayed by his position as MP for the two universities that had been spurned by the Bell trustees, while, beyond doubt, a fear of offending Church of Scotland opinion and the Glasgow electorate had pushed all four Conservative ministers into being extremely cautious.

Certainly the two "Bell" universities and their supporters had been deceived by the initial success of their lobbying. Writers in the journals had already assumed that the Chairs were established and were beginning to discuss the details of their possible progress.⁹⁹ A *Scotsman* report on January 18th 1875 reported it as an accomplished fact that the government had already augmented the Edinburgh stipend and on that same day at a meeting of the Edinburgh University Endowment Association, Hodgson had so assumed that all was settled on the salary front that he began to make a further plea for an endowment of travelling scholarships to send teachers who had sat at the new Professor's feet to "various countries on the Continent and (to) the United States if necessary..."¹⁰⁰

Ironically, such was the confidence of the chairs' supporters that they never seem to have finally pressed financial arguments, earlier hinted at, which might well have

won the day, such as the argument that teacher-training within the university sector rather than in the Normal Schools might actually have proved cheaper for government. The Blue Book of 1875 had given the total expenditure on the six denominational centres as £26,500 for 817 students; of this £21,269 had had to be provided by government, with the churches subscribing little more than £1 per head. Thus each student cost government some £26 per head compared with the £12 per head that, according to Grant, Edinburgh received from each of its undergraduates.¹⁰¹ Playfair also emphasised that while, overall, a Normal School student cost £75-80 p.a., the studentships proposed in the universities' training plan would cost only £50¹⁰² but such a case was either ignored or was never made.

Shairp was later (at the end of 1875) to describe the campaign's progress:

"In January 1874 Principal Tulloch and I...went to London and having seen Lord Aberdare, the President of the Privy Council under the late administration, we laid before him the view of the Senate regarding the training of teachers and a definite scheme embodying the same. These were received by Lord Aberdare favourably almost beyond our hope...One thing only we saw - that it would greatly further our plan if we had in this university a professor of education."¹⁰³

However, Aberdare did, of course, disappear with Gladstone and was replaced by the Duke of Richmond and the next deputation (a joint one with Edinburgh) went not to Richmond but to the new Chancellor of the Exchequer who seemed the obvious person to approach about an augmentation of the Chairs' endowment. Only later was Richmond approached and, as some would claim, the damage had already been done. His proposal was that before giving his opinion, he should receive a further joint paper on teacher-training from all four universities. He (or his department) may already have intended this as an effort to divide and rule, knowing Aberdeen's poverty and Glasgow's distrust of the whole chairs scheme. A joint meeting of the four universities *was* held (though with considerably less senior representation on the part of Aberdeen and Glasgow than of Edinburgh and St. Andrews¹⁰⁴), a further joint plan

was submitted to SED, and all appeared to go well. Indeed £200 was now promised to both of the universities with a chair in prospect.¹⁰⁵ But the wind from the west then began to be felt in earnest. A delegation led by Whitelaw also saw the Duke of Richmond and from that point on, as Shairp was later to put it, "no more (was) heard of the draft (joint four) proposals for the training of schoolmasters".¹⁰⁶

The money for the Chairs themselves did, however, seem safe until the Scottish university estimates were published in the March of 1875. These certainly contained the promised estimate of £200 for the Edinburgh chair but the St. Andrews £200 had disappeared thus convincing many people there that their case was lost.¹⁰⁷ On April 8th the Chancellor assured the House, however, that this had been a mere slip of the pen (a claim that not all of the press believed)¹⁰⁸ but, more sinisterly he linked this explanation to an expression of his own personal opinion that "the chairs ought to be of a purely scientific nature".¹⁰⁹ He understood the Bell money was to be for the purpose of teaching the theory and science of teaching and that it was *not connected with any practical work*, a belief that flew in the face of all the existing public statements by the chairs' supporters, by the universities concerned and by the Bell trustees themselves. He "certainly never supposed that the chairs would interfere with the system of primary education in the Normal Schools of Scotland".

Such a statement by a leading politician was either disingenuous or it showed a remarkable ignorance of major discussions taking place not merely in Scotland but also in the London press, as they reported national conventions such as the Social Science Congresses which had discussed the Scottish chairs in detail at their meetings in both Norwich and Glasgow. A far simpler explanation, of course, was the effect of the Glasgow/Church lobbying and what the *Scotsman* believed was the growing dispute over this matter between the Scotch Education Department and the Treasury, though even the latter, despite its largesse in the case of the other chairs, almost certainly had doubts about pouring money into "uncontrolled" bodies for purposes of secondary school training.¹¹⁰

Certainly the consternation in pro-Chair circles was sufficient to reawaken the interest of the EIS who quickly forwarded to government a petition signed on an earlier occasion by almost a thousand teachers but which had been "laid aside" as a result of their confidence in the government's goodwill. Nevertheless, the view of the chairs' functions embodied in the chancellor's statement of April 8th not only won the day but was to dominate the subsequent development of the Chairs' operations and it is worth speculating whether, in the absence of the subsidy request, there would ever have been such an opportunity for Whitehall to state its views so categorically on what was basically an academic issue. Certainly the lobbyists seized their opportunity. On April 15th, a disturbed member of the Edinburgh General Council wrote to the *Scotsman*.

"...It is almost incredible, though it is affirmed by competent authority, that a gentleman claiming to represent the University of Glasgow is in London doing his utmost to induce members of the House of Commons to vote against the grant proposed by the government..."

There is no hint in the Glasgow University records of any formal decision by the University to launch a campaign against the chairs. Indeed, the University itself was, however half-heartedly, still committed to the joint four plan.¹¹¹ But there was certainly some opposition among some Senate members that may well have lingered on. Glasgow was eventually to be the only one of the four universities not to bestow an honorary degree on Laurie, the first Edinburgh professor, who, in western Free Church quarters, may well have been held responsible for the whole affair, given his friendship with Cook and the likelihood of his being given the appointment. Other Glasgow Senate members may simply have seen the Edinburgh Chair as an expensive precedent that they, as the other major university, would be compelled to follow at a time of particular financial difficulty following the erection of the new buildings at Gilmorehill.¹¹² Judging from Shairp's comments, however, it seems more likely that a spirit of opposition had grown up in religious and political rather than academic circles in the West that could easily have led some strongly motivated University

individual to claim in London that he was speaking, albeit informally, on behalf not only of his church but of his Court or Senate colleagues.

In any case the meetings of the General Assemblies of the two main churches at the end of May soon made it clear that the church lobbyists' demands with or without academic support were fundamental enough to put the future even of the Edinburgh Chair in jeopardy. The assemblies were told that a joint delegation to the Lord Advocate had expressed the "fear that the religious teaching of young men training for the profession might not be maintained (if the chairs were established) and that in the course of time the Training Colleges ... might be materially injured by the withdrawal of the male students" who would use the university course as an alternative. Stevenson, the chairman of the Established Church's education committee made it clear that their deputation's concern had been as much with religious as educational or financial issues.¹¹³ They had, he said, exacted from the government the condition that the new professors in the universities of Scotland "who are not now in any sense whatever under the control of the Church of Scotland" would at any rate "be practisers of the Christian religion".¹¹⁴ What he appeared to have in mind was the revival of religious tests for the appointment to these particular two posts. Such a revival would have been in itself politically hazardous but the government did attempt a compromise by insisting that as a condition of the £200 grant, they (the government) should make the first appointments. How far this really was the result of Stevenson's representation (in which case it would be a remarkable rejection of the spirit of much nineteenth century legislation) or how far it arose from a more narrowly political concern to defend the Revised Code against potential academic critics and to keep the Normal Schools and the inspectorate happy is of course no longer clear. What *is* certain is that it considerably offended the Bell Trustees who threatened to withdraw their own money if they did not have the same right of first appointment that had been enjoyed by all recent endowers of new Edinburgh chairs, even in those cases where government augmentation had also taken place.¹¹⁵

While there was general certainty that the first two appointees would be good Presbyterians (indeed Laurie's appointment was already being taken for granted in some quarters) the General Assembly debates on the issue had deliberately raised the spectre of a future infidel in such a chair influencing all Scottish teachers and this did a great deal to disturb that link between the Bell Chairs and the Faculties of Divinity upon which Cook himself had assumed much would be built. True, Black, Professor of Humanity at Aberdeen, had fervently defended the Chairs in the Established Church Assembly, claiming that 99% of the population were in favour of a university education for teachers,¹¹⁶ but clearly other colleagues either supported the Education Committee's line or kept their silence. Indeed Stevenson's strong belligerence had in the minds of some of the public cast Grant and Shairp in the unaccustomed role of a Huxley or a Darwin as underminers of established religion. And even though some of the Normal School representatives, anxious that the case should not be overstated, protested that they had no objection to the universities training secondary teachers and, indeed, that they themselves were attempting to develop for their primary students the type of theoretical studies being outlined for the chairs, the damage was done.

The Free Church Assembly had no great debate, being apparently content to hear the chief education spokesman say that while they had an open mind on the chairs, "if they interfered with the Normal Schools they would oppose them but if a separate sphere were assigned to them, they would go along with it" but by the time a Committee of the House of Commons came to debate the matter of the £200 grants it was generally felt that the public debate was already over, that the government's mind was made up and that the future of Scottish religion as well as government money and Normal School jobs were all at stake.

This short parliamentary debate occurred on July 31st 1875,¹¹⁷ a Saturday in summer on the eve of the shooting season, when only a handful of members appeared to be interested. It was handled by the one "Scottish" minister who had not

been directly involved, namely Cross, the Home Secretary, who was thus able to draw attention away from any dispute there had been between SED and Treasury. He claimed that since the first promise of government support had been made, new problems had arisen about

1. The relationship of the chairs to the work of the Normal Schools.
2. The terms of the foundation, which left the functions of the chair too vague.
3. The first exercise of patronage.

In fact, of course, these had been matters of public debate before the government had even been approached and the real factor now was the impact of the Glasgow/Church lobby.

In a debate in which a mere dozen or so members participated¹¹⁸ speaker after speaker, following the lead of Whitelaw, attacked the notion of having the Chairs at all. The religious issue was certainly raised as well as the threat to the Normal Schools, in which, of course, the government even more than the churches now had a major financial stake especially in view of the recent capital investment in Aberdeen. The old canard of Lowe, that there was no such thing as a science of education was quoted in full, and it was duly claimed that good teachers were born and not made and that the only worthwhile training was by practice. Thus the whole fifty year campaign of Bryce, Pillans and Jolly was quickly set at nought. One or two detached English observers like Mundella defended the Chairs in reasonable terms in an hour or two of not very profound debate but even their keenest advocates like the Bell universities' own Member, Lyon Playfair, were clearly in retreat. All Playfair could do was forcefully and somewhat damagingly deny any intention that the new Professors would indulge in practical teacher-training and play up the Chairs' role as the intellectual climax of the profession's search for social recognition. Indeed he retreated so convincingly that even Campbell-Bannerman, who, as one of his supporters, had pleaded the cause

of secondary training, was embarrassed by the vagueness that now seemed to surround the Chairs' proposed functions.

In the end the government was able "temporarily" to withdraw its offer of the £200 without being forced to ally itself too openly with either the religious lobby or the Normal Schools. Instead it was "bowing to public pressure". It was able with some justification to claim that the poorly attended debate in parliament had revealed not merely some concern but also considerable apathy even in Scotland over such a potentially important issue. Cross decided to withdraw the vote for that year "in order that Scotland ought to have an opportunity of considering the matter in all its bearings so that when it was brought forward another year it might be clearly understood what the foundations of these Chairs were to be."

The detached attitude of the *Glasgow Herald* may also have been crucial in helping to convince Cross of general Scottish apathy. For example, in 1875 alone, it had reported the March meeting of the St. Andrews General Council without the important debate on the missing £200, and in May it made no comment on the General Assemblies' discussion of the matter, just as in the previous year it reported Grant's important Sessional address without the vivid Education chair section and in the Social Science Congress report, omitted everything but his apparently facetious remark about the new professor being "a very superior head of a Training College". Even the final parliamentary debate, in which Glaswegians had played such a prominent and destructive part, was reported by it in far less detail than elsewhere and it received no immediate editorial comment of any kind.

But this is not the only reason why it has to be recognised that the government's claim to have "discovered apathy" cannot be dismissed as totally unfounded. The lack of sustained debate on the issues in the correspondence columns of the other Scottish newspapers is in marked contrast to the concurrent debate on the proposed Edinburgh Celtic Chair, and the absence from virtually all debate of Professor Blackie

usually vociferous on all important issues. Nor was apathy absent in the reputedly crusading teaching profession itself. The A.G.M. of the Free Church Teachers Association held in September 1874 compiled a list of six priorities for Scottish education. Neither the word "chair" nor even the word "university" appeared in any of them;¹¹⁹ while even Donaldson at the EIS Congress three months later was "not inclined to be so hopeful" because of the failure of teachers to "come forward and say (what) they wanted in higher education".¹²⁰ Shairp as one of the Principals of an almost destitute St. Andrews more than anyone knew only too well the results that this could have and was also despairing. Addressing his General Council in March 1875 he said that "Anyone who knew the Education Department in London knew the solid, determined phalanx it presented. Petitions from Scotland were no more thought of than the idle wind...Nothing would move them there but a *unanimous* and loud demand from the people of Scotland. If this University or all the Universities together were to petition, the Department would not care a pinch of snuff for it. They must have unanimity. But when could they expect unanimity in Scotland upon this or any other mortal subject? If the Church, the Bar or the Universities were to be swept away, they would not get unanimity even to oppose that".¹²¹

At the EIS's A.G.M. in September 1875 Hodgson spoke of the "sad, strange and tangled story. It was," he said, "much to be deplored that the Bell trustees were not left to effect what, if he were rightly informed, was their original design, to institute a Chair in Edinburgh alone." This could eventually, after experiment and development, have provided a possible model for developments elsewhere. Instead, they had been embarrassed into making their offer to St. Andrews, which was less financially stable and far more inclined than Edinburgh to venture into the general teacher-training field. In order to bolster their Chair's standing, they had carried all four universities into a minefield and had altered the whole course of the Scottish profession's development.

As it was, both universities, having spoken so long of the educational desirability of the Chairs, were now committed to their establishment on what was generally

agreed to be an inadequate financial foundation, if only to rob their enemies of total victory and not to insult the Bell Trustees. Both Grant and Shairp spoke bitterly of their opponents but had to speak also of possible developments. In theory the government had merely postponed their decision for a year (though they never returned to the matter) and the College of Preceptors were convinced that because of English developments, such a small grant would soon be forthcoming.¹²² The other two Scottish universities were also still committed to developing the joint plans,¹²³ while from Aberdeen University in particular there had been promising support in the General Assembly as well as continued EIS support, even after the parliamentary debate, for the Northern Counties initiative.¹²⁴

There was, moreover, despite Mr Cross's discouragement the legal possibility of developing secondary teacher-training, a role willingly accorded to them for the moment even by their Normal School opponents and one particularly suited to the Edinburgh and St. Andrews situations where high level potential practice schools already existed. The St. Andrews General Council in particular kept alive the reforming spirit of the post-1872 period that had provided the rhetoric for their Chair-search in the first place, while all the General Councils felt their universities should play a more active role in an improvement of secondary teaching standards in order in turn to improve the quality of their own entrants, but the universities may have felt bound to observe Playfair's concessions if the possibility of a future grant was to be kept alive.

Moreover interest gradually moved away from the universities' direct involvement in pedagogical training and the possible raising of professional status by the development of a science of education to a more general interest in raising the general cultural level of aspiring teachers. Questions of the relationship of universities to teacher-training came to centre more and more on the admission of more Normal School students to the Arts courses rather than to any university-based professional training and the two new Chairs were often seen as something of an irrelevance when such matters were discussed.

Writing to the *Scotsman* a fortnight after the parliamentary debate,¹²⁵ HMI Kerr declared himself once more to be very much in favour of University training but not in favour of the Chairs. "As to the solid culture and practical skill which you and I desire, I am of the opinion, right or wrong, that a Chair of Education of the character proposed would furnish little of either the one or the other. I do not say that a judicious professor might not impart into his lectures on the theory of teaching psychology or other collateral matter that would be stimulative of thought and so tend to culture; but if the chair is to be what it professes, the theory of teaching must be the burden of its song. This being so, I should be surprised if anyone were to maintain that in the hands of the average professor such a course of lectures would contribute so much to wider and more solid culture as attendance at any of the Arts classes." Even at that early stage he was correctly guessing the current direction of public concern, especially as the general British battle for an acceptance of pedagogical theory had still to be won, not least in academic circles.

After fifty years of effort, the ultimate effect, then, of the founding of the Scottish Chairs was to produce a general feeling of anti-climax. The very next EIS A.G.M. with a Normal School principal in the chair, was to ignore the matter and despite their being the first Chairs of this kind in any English-speaking university, most Scottish histories and memoirs have largely ignored their foundation ever since. Even among those who did remember the stirring events of 1875, the matter seemed at most to be of secondary importance. The Chairs are not mentioned, for example, in the "Short Studies in Education in Scotland" (1904) by Clarke, principal of the Aberdeen Training Centre and the first university lecturer in Aberdeen, now in Milligan's influential "Is Teaching a Profession?" (Glasgow 1884) where the Chairs' fate would surely have been of relevance, while even Kerr's own "Memories" (1911) again leaves the subject untouched. As we noted earlier, they are given scant and not always accurate treatment in such modern histories as those of Cruickshank and Scotland. Yet, in the fifty years up to 1875, the idea of such "Education Chairs" had sustained an

anticipatory literature of great liveliness and hope and seemed to lie at the very centre of Scottish professional aspirations.

Where the hopes were apparently sustained more readily was outside Scotland and in other English-speaking countries where the establishment of the two Chairs seemed in its mere symbolic importance to have transcended all the growing Scottish restrictions that settled on their functioning. A number of subsequent English histories have dealt in detail with the Scottish events and their significance. G.E. Jones for example in his critical survey of teacher training published in 1924 gives a far more accurate account of Scottish events than is usually found in Scottish secondary sources, while at the time those English journals that noted the events in detail were often more depressed and agitated by them than were their Scottish counterparts, with the College of Preceptors' own journal providing the most bitter of the epitaphs on the parliamentary debate...

"We have preached for some years a doctrine that is so entirely opposed to the prejudices, the opinions and the mental grooves of the public that we should be surprised indeed if the debate had taken any other course. We have lamented so often that the mass of people regard teaching as a thing that comes by nature and can be undertaken at a moment's notice by those who have failed in everything else, or see no other opening, that we should have lost something of our self-esteem had there been a larger proportion of intelligence in the discussion."¹²⁶

Judging from the almost total absence of letter comment in the Scottish press, it is doubtful if many EIS members felt so strongly, especially as the ever widening opportunities for teachers to attend the universities Arts courses seemed both more promising and more important than any German-style pedagogical studies.

Even so, American reactions were more exalted. Payne, the first Michigan professor and, indeed, the first holder of a permanent American Education chair, writing in 1886 and still struggling with the public question of whether there really was a science of education, saw Scotland, incredibly, as having now finally joined the ranks of the great continental models in its acceptance of such a science. "When, in

1876, a chair of education was established in the University of Edinburgh there was not a teacher in the United Kingdom who might not have felt a new pride in his calling" he declared, "and I know that more than one teacher on this side of the Atlantic worked under a new inspiration from that day forward. By the simple fact of such recognition the entire teaching profession has been ennobled; and there is a tendency in the universities of this country to follow a precedent..."¹²⁷

Whether the effects were quite so momentous or so generally exalting in Scotland, even in Edinburgh and St. Andrews, was, of course, a different matter.

NOTES

1. Brown (1820) Vol I p 59.
2. Bryce, Testimonials (1875) p v.
3. *Education Times* 1 Apr 1874.
4. In Carlisle, for example, the school associated with Messrs Dixon's Cotton factory was, in 1847, described in the local Directory as operating on the system "adopted in the Edinburgh Sessional School" Mannix and Whellan (1847) p 139. See also Smith (1923) p 49.
5. *Scotsman* 25 Aug 1874.
6. Bryce (1828) p v.
7. Bryce (1852) p 11.
8. Lalor (1839) p 122 ff.
9. Southey (1844) Vol III p 700.
10. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1874.
11. Quoted by Lalor (1839).
12. *Educational News* 24 Mar 1883. Bryce felt that their joint influence might have been greater if his friend Sir Thomas Wyse had not left parliament for India.
13. Adamson (1930) p 26.
14. "An Old Student" (1869) p 17.
15. Pillans (1828) p 71.
16. Pillans (1862) p 18.
17. "An Old Student" (1869) pp 33-5. Lord John was an examiner at Borough Rd College in London.
18. For example in the issue of Jul 1834 in which he put forward some practical suggestions for the endowment of such lectureships.
19. Pillans (1854).
20. Pillans (1848) (1854).
21. Pillans (1856) p 164.
22. Earlier, in the *Edinburgh Review* article reprinted in Pillans (1856) p 164 he had merely suggested a lectureship but his view later hardened into a conviction that a Chair was necessary. This paper explains his earlier somewhat optimistic view that "a very small

endowment, if any, would be wanted" though he made it clear that such an assertion was made on the assumption "Parliament would make it imperative on candidates for vacant schools (beginning at first with those of the better kind only) to produce a certificate of having attended such a course" - a sure guarantee of the lecturer's income. Bryce (1828) had made the same suggestion (p v).

23. "An Old Student" (1869) p 32, blames Lowe entirely for the failure of this scheme and relates his parsimony to his further refusal of £2,000 to the Faculty of Advocates in connection with their gift of their Library which became the nucleus of the National Library of Scotland.
24. Combe (1841) pp 443-4. He also positively welcomed the "avoiding of difficulty (in the university) in regard to religious instruction". A good account of Combe's educational ideas appears in Jolly (1879) who was clearly influenced by him.
25. Belford (1946) p 333, though, from the beginning, there were some members who felt that technical professional training should be left to the Normal Schools "in partnership with the universities".
26. College of Preceptors (1896).
27. Hodgson, one of the Scottish professors most fervent in his support of both the EIS and the Chairs, had been a Newcastle Commissioner. Tropp (1957) p 64.
28. Glasgow (1875) notes, for example, how in 1858 they "issued proposals for a chair but nothing came of it".
29. Hodgson in particular "despaired of sectarian differences in the EIS" *Scotsman* 30 Dec 1874.
30. C C Report for 1874 (pp 1875 xxvi 1).
31. C C Report for 1875 (pp 1876 xxv 1).
32. C C Report for 1873 (pp 1874 xx 399).
33. E.g. in the *Schoolmaster* 25 Oct 1873, the *Fortnightly Review* 1873 pp 353-376 etc.
34. *Eastern Daily Press* Supplement in the issue of 9 Oct 1873.
35. *Scotsman* 27 Sep 1873.
36. *Museum* Vol II p 199.
37. *Museum* Vol II p 199.
38. Reprinted in Donaldson (1874).
39. Glasgow (1875).
40. *Ibid.*

41. Belford (1946) p 342. A full account of the subsequent attempts at fund-raising are given in the *Schoolmaster* 25 Oct 1873.
42. Glasgow (1875).
43. Reprinted in Pillans (1856) p 184.
44. Endowed Schools (Scotland) Commission 1874 Report (p 379 ff).
45. Grant (1884) Vol ii p 150.
46. Southey (1844) Vol 3 p 403 ff; Rich (1933) p 258 also talks of a Bell "lectureship" having been established (giving no source) but this seems to exaggerate the significance of the events described in Southey.
47. *St. Andrews Alumnus Chronicle* Jan 1950 p 34.
48. The most satisfactory accounts of the Bell fund's history, apart from that given by Cook to the Commission appear in Smith (1913) p 173 and Morgan (1927) p 112 ff. Smith is particularly interesting on the fate of the Glasgow fund, which was not as mysterious as Boyd suggests in his autobiography, but was largely squandered, Smith felt, on the award of minor bursaries.
49. Bryce (1828) Appendix.
50. Cockburn (1888) p 229.
51. In fact, no satisfactory training was ever imposed on such individuals and Boyd describes how a quarter of a century later, he, as an untrained graduate, was examined for competence in reading: 'The Inspector had to hear me read and teach. He lifted his *Glasgow Herald* and pointed to the opening sentences of the leading article. I read a single sentence. "Very good," he said and recorded the fact on an official form. So that somewhere in the archives of the SED, it is noted that in 1902 I was a very good reader'. Boyd Autobiography p 171.
52. A report to the Senate from the Faculty of Arts (Mar 29 1873) mentions the prospect of endowments for a chair.
53. Edin Sen 21 Feb 1874.
54. Ross (1883) *Education as a University Subject*
55. Free Church Assembly Reports 1875.
56. *Glasgow Herald* 30 Aug 1875.
57. Edin Sen 28 Mar 1874.
58. *Eastern Daily Press Supplement* 9 Oct 1873.
59. *Educational Times* 1 Dec 1874.
60. The importance of this support is particularly emphasised by

Adamson (1930) who notes (p 485) how some Conference members, "along with Training College Principals, school inspectors and others unsuccessfully approached the Charity Commissioners, the Education Department and the universities" in 1875 "to no avail", as part of their campaign to improve secondary teaching. The thought that such demands might be expensively renewed in England may have led to the Scottish proposals being finally rejected by government. However, it should be noted that not all HMC supporters of training at the 1872 Conference felt that it must necessarily be provided in universities.

61. *Educational Times* 1 Apr 1874. This report was linked to an appeal for funds from English teachers "to show their sympathy with their fellow teachers in Scotland" by supporting the foundation of at least one chair there. The extension of the appeal to the English NUET is also noted in the *Schoolmaster* 19 Sep 1874.
62. Anderson (1983) p 156 emphasises in particular the financial advantage of teacher training as a way of attracting the older working-class student who might otherwise be excluded by the new entrance examinations.
63. *Schoolmaster* 16 May 1874.
64. Smith (1913) p 125 claimed that such attendance was initially an Established Church initiative but Belford (1946) p 340 insists that Free Church students had already begun such concurrent attendance in the 1860s and certainly, by 1865, HMI Kerr had outlined a national scheme for such attendance which came to fruition in the 1873 Code. Kerr had emphasised the value of such attendance in his personal Report for 1867-8 (C C Report pp 404-10) and his views were endorsed by the Argyll Commission. Anderson (1983) p 84.
65. *Scotsman* 28 Feb 1874. "The addition of this Chair will enable the University to give a complete curriculum for teachers' degrees under Section 59 of the Education Act and attract to the University students from both Scotland and England, who will prefer the status which a University degree would confer to the certificate of training colleges."
66. *Scotsman* 9 Jan 1874.
67. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1875.
68. *Edin Sen* 29 Mar 1873 and subsequent.
69. In Oxford, the detailed petition of the Scholastic Registration Council led by the Master of Charterhouse seems to have led nowhere "but the plan had at least been received". Tomlinson (1968) p 295.
70. *Glasgow Herald* 20 Oct 1874.
71. *Scotsman* 29 Dec 1874.
72. *Scotsman* 2 Nov 1875.

73. Hinsdale (1900) notes how the word "didactics" was similarly scoffed at in the Rhode Island legislature.
74. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1874.
75. *Ibid.*
76. For example Scougal, the Western Inspector in his report for 1876-7 (pp 1877 xxxii), though Ogilvie (Dunbarton, Stirling and Clackmannan) in the same volume, agreeing that "higher learning is already on the inclined plane" suggested as a remedy *closer* links between teacher and university.
77. Cruickshank (1970) p 96.
78. Scotland (1969a) Vol 2 p 149 mentions a sum of £18,000 and implies that Laurie actually *did* give lectures on the Madras system. Equally unsatisfactory are the accounts found in Adamson (1930) p 479, and Armytage (1955b) p 10, the latter apparently depending on the former. The source of their mistaken impression that Gladstone's government donated the entire endowment may be a hasty footnote to a lecture by Payne noting that he had recently heard of an appeal by the Bell Trustees and the Edinburgh Senate to which the government had responded "by granting a sum of £10,000". Strange to say, the erroneous footnote was not corrected even when printed in his collected lectures some five years later. (Payne (1880) p 332.) Mackintosh (1962) p 64 also discusses the matter in some detail and not entirely accurately without quoting her sources.
79. His letter published on 16 Aug 1875, for example, is in no way an official response to a combative editorial but is couched in the first person and is full of personal opinions.
80. Cruickshank notes that the Argyll Report of 1867 had been full of praise for the existing Normal Schools. "There are no teachers to be compared with those who have been (there)" Argyll Report Vol II p cxlv. Fitch (1876) p 102 talks of their defending their "patent rights", though he felt it was not easy for the "outside public to share in the storm".
81. E.g. at the EIS Annual General Meeting of 1874.
82. *Scotsman* 29 Dec 1874.
83. *Scotsman* 29 Dec 1874.
84. *Scotsman* 6 Jan 1875.
85. At that time the only exception was the training of a small number of Episcopalian teachers.
86. Anderson (1983) p 104 notes how the 1861 abolition of religious tests for burgh and parish schoolmasters and the transfer of their examination from presbytery to university had already been seen as a victory for the secularisers.

87. Gunn (1921) p 418. "The (Free Church) Education Committee were opposed to this University movement mainly ... on the ground of its making no provision for the religious training of the teachers, or for preparing them to give Bible teaching in their schools", though the Free Church may also have feared Established Church bias in the new Professors. Laurie, chief education official of the Church of Scotland was likely to hold one of the chairs and, in any case, as Anderson (1983) notes (p 54), although religious tests had been abolished by the Act of 1853, professors had still (until 1889) to make a declaration that they would teach nothing opposed to the doctrines of the Established Church.
88. *Scotsman* editorial 24 Sep 1874.
89. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1875.
90. Though, as Stewart (1927) notes (p 129) the University commissioners did make attempts to require legislation for the funding of new chairs, some of which, they felt, "may be highly beneficial, while others may be of doubtful expediency".
91. Edin Sen 28 Feb 1874. The Arts Faculty agreed to acceptance "provided supplement can be got from government or otherwise ... to secure ... an annual salary of not less than £400".
92. Edin Fac of Arts 24 Feb 1874.
93. *Scotsman* 5 Mar 1874.
94. Edin Sen 21 Feb 1874.
95. Stocks (1986) has noted for example the influence in such matters of Donaldson's friendship with the Liberal Rosebery.
96. The Glasgow School Board demonstrated its support for the Training Centres by refusing to employ graduates who had not attended them. Cruickshank (1970) p 126.
97. This was certainly the view of a *Scotsman* editorial 2 Aug 1875.
98. The same *Scotsman* editorial spoke of the government being "scored" by Mr Whitelaw - "a sad enough plight for any government to confess to".
99. An article by Eve in the *Monthly Journal of Education* (1875) p 402, for example, discusses the need to reach teachers already in post.
100. *Scotsman* 19 Jan 1875.
101. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1874.
102. *Schoolmaster* 16 May 1874.
103. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1875. Knight (1888) p 373 sees the matter as one of some importance for Shairp in the context of his career as a whole.

104. Edin Sen 28 Nov 1874.
105. Edin Sen 30 Jan 1875.
106. *Scotsman* 3 Nov 1875.
107. St A G C 25 Mar 1875.
108. *Scotsman* editorial 10 Apr 1875.
109. *Scotsman* 9 Apr 1875.
110. *Scotsman* 14 Apr 1875.
111. The Senate minutes of 5 Nov 1874 and 10 Dec 1874 record discussions of this and even when its rejection by SED is reported (22 Apr 1875) there is no rejoicing.
112. Mackie (1954) p 278. In the year 1876-77 the new Professor of Physiology had to pay for his own assistant and all his necessary laboratory apparatus, leaving him with a net annual income of a mere £8.
113. *Scotsman* 25 May 1875.
114. Stevenson also insisted on the notion that the chair's work would be purely theoretical, possibly giving a clue to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's "belief" that this was so.
115. Edin Sen 25 Jun, 25 Oct 1875.
116. *Scotsman* 25 May 1875.
117. Hansard (Commons) 31 Jul 1875.
118. According to the *Educational Times* (1 Sep 1874) "out of 650 members, nine only (were) found to interest themselves in a great educational measure; out of the nine, two (were) found to support it, and only two ..." but as there was no actual division, Hansard gives no indication of how many members were present.
119. *Scotsman* 19 Sep 1874.
120. *Scotsman* 21 Dec 1874.
121. St A G C 25 Mar 1875.
122. *Educational Times* 1 Mar 1876.
123. The SED in rejecting the first joint-four suggestions had suggested they "wait to see how things work out". Glas Sen 22 Apr 1875.
124. *Scotsman* 20 Sep 1875.
125. *Scotsman* 16 Aug 1875.
126. *Educational Times* 1 Sep 1875.

127. Payne (1886) p 258.

CHAPTER 3
LAURIE AND MEIKLEJOHN

The establishment of education chairs was not a new thing on the European scene and their advocates in Scotland had for decades pointed to the existence of pedagogical studies in the German and Swiss universities. Even in the Russian empire, for long considered an educational backwater by westerners, a chair had already been established at Helsinki in 1852,¹ so that the concept was not in itself astonishing, albeit "foreign". Thus, whatever the elation of educationists in North America and other parts of the English-speaking world, the reception accorded to the chairs in Britain itself was at best somewhat muted, and at worst downright sceptical. True, the *Westminster Review*² spoke of it as marking "an epoch in the history of education", but on the whole the English newspapers ignored the matter or merely announced the professors' appointment as a routine. The *Quarterly Review* suggested that they were doubtless "gentlemen of the widest attainments and the highest dialectic skill. But if so (they could) only condole with them on being the representatives of a Science whose very name is embodied pedantry and which might have found a fitting home among the inhabitants of Laputa."³

In the *Monthly Journal of Education*⁴ what was presumably a specially contrived letter embodying common contemporary attitudes, was published as coming from a parent:

'What on earth is the meaning of these chairs one hears of in the Scotch Universities? What in the name of commonsense is a Professor of Education? What can there be to profess? To my mind I send my boy into the country to get rid of him; he is very troublesome at home and I have no time to waste on him...At school I suppose he worries his masters but that I pay for as well as to have him taught...What need is there for a profession in all this? As to schoolmasters the public ones strike me as graduates who are not likely to get on in business and probably are too poor for the professions and the private ones, when successful, are generally a rather superior tradesman...I have met one or two people who regard teaching as a learned profession but these are just the men I would not send my son to...

And even in Scotland where the teaching profession already enjoyed a somewhat higher status the reception, though enthusiastic in some quarters (such as the Northern branches of the Educational Institute) hardly involved widespread rejoicing among educationists generally. Even those who had strongly advocated the chairs were hardly satisfied with the financial arrangements and by the attitude towards them adopted by Government. They were depressed also by the continued absence of chairs in Glasgow and Aberdeen and by the antagonism that had been shown to the whole project by the Education Committees of the Churches. In the circumstances, therefore, it was not surprising that EIS spokesmen found it difficult to maintain their earlier enthusiasm for the ultimate prospect of Faculties of Education and a graduate profession. Their journal, attempting to awaken a new interest in Whitehall, seized upon a suggestion that education professors might actually help to improve efficiency under payment by results, pointing to Blackie's plan for cheaper ways of teaching Greek as an example of the benefits that might accrue from well-endowed chairs.⁵ But in the months which followed many Institute spokesmen continued to lose heart. Some even feared (in the end groundlessly) that the much discussed proposal to open a "branch" of London University in Edinburgh might mean that Scottish teachers would spurn their own universities in favour of part-time, distance degrees likely to be better understood by employers in England and the other countries welcoming Scottish immigrant teachers.⁶ Jolly, more surprisingly, no longer mentioned the subject in his annual reports and at the various committees and commissions that were to investigate the chairs' role in teacher training during the next twenty years, EIS representation was low-key and not very influential. It is true that they were to make Principal Shairp, the great champion of the chairs, their president in 1878 but in place of major figures such as Hodgson, who had led the fight in the early 70s, the delegation to the Universities Commission in 1877, for example, was led by Sewell, a non-graduate village teacher,⁷ while the later commissioners of 1892 met no EIS representative at all.

The outcome was of course particularly disappointing for the two universities housing the chairs. Their Principals had often committed themselves optimistically and publicly on the issue but always in the confident expectation of adequate financial support from government, and in the end their decision to tolerate an inadequate endowment smacked more of face-saving than continuing enthusiasm, however brave a face Grant of Edinburgh put on it in his new history of the university published eight years later when he spoke confidently of the chair's having given those intending to be schoolmasters an opportunity to "learn within the university walls all that has hitherto been arrived at as to the philosophy and technique of their profession."⁸ In fact the position in 1884 was somewhat more complex, as will be noted below, though no doubt he and the two St. Andrews Principals⁹ were somewhat relieved when in 1879 the Cambridge Syndicate launched their own course on pedagogy and kindred subjects. Laurie, the son-in-law of Pillans and first holder of the Edinburgh chair had pointed out in his Inaugural how important it was for academic leaders to feel that their activities duplicated those in the most prestigious non-Scottish universities.

"Timid and distrustful and accustomed to follow precedent as the sole safe guide, they have been groping about to find what other people are thinking. What would they say at Oxford and Cambridge? What do they do at Paris and Berlin?"¹⁰

At Cambridge at any rate (not to mention Berlin) the answer appeared positive. There lectures 'for any interested students' had been initiated at the request of the Headmasters Conference whose members, under the influence of figures such as Thring, did not at that point share the common scepticism about such studies that was generally found in England. The Syndics left their organisation in the hands of Oscar Browning and for the first lecture course they acquired the services of R.H. Quick, a writer well known on both sides of the Atlantic, whose work was to be a basic ingredient in University Education courses for some decades. He was not however a professor and in no way a permanent figure on the Cambridge scene,

certainly nothing on the Scottish model. He was paid an honorarium of a mere £25 and attracted few students other than the (non-graduating) ladies from Girton and Newnham.¹¹ "Under-graduates," he later wrote, "don't care about it. They, of course, are affected by the feeling of their elders and there is no likelihood of their valuing a subject of this kind when their seniors are one and all indifferent to it Besides Oscar Browning, who came officially, there were, I think 8 to 10 young men and two dons (at the first lecture)." St. John's choristers were allowed to create a disturbance outside the window and the students who *were* there seemed disappointed by the discursive and non-factual nature of Quick's material and on later occasions he noticed that even such small audiences were declining.¹²

As a result, by 1894 according to Sidgwick, the Cambridge experiment had become "almost inoperative ... so far as the schoolmasters for whose benefit it was primarily instituted (were) concerned", even if it did prove useful to women secondary teachers¹³ and this disappointing fate for what had promised to be a prestigious English boost to university studies in Education must have been a deep disappointment to the supporters of innovation in Edinburgh and St. Andrews even though the Cambridge experiment did at least produce a "distance" Certificate that Laurie's students could attempt in the days before the Scottish universities provided their own paper qualifications for Educational Studies.¹⁴ Nearer home, equally depressing, was the continued opposition in the Churches and their Education committees, some of whose members continued to see in the Chairs a prestigious rival of a secular nature to their own teacher training establishments. Their misgivings were still being expressed in late 1876 as the professors took office and it was unlikely that the 'Church in Danger' men as Laurie called them,¹⁵ would be finally reassured for some time. Until the final year of the century what appeared to be guerilla warfare against the university was reported especially from the large Free Church colleges. Paterson, the head of Moray House, the F.C. Centre in Edinburgh, emphasised to students concurrently attending university classes, that their College

work must take precedence, excusing none of them from College examinations which often duplicated those being taken in the university. To some extent such an attitude may be explained by his having considered himself a candidate for Laurie's chair¹⁶ but Rusk, as a student in the Glasgow F.C. Centre also found difficulties placed in the way of university attendance, which was only allowed between 8.00 and 9.00 a.m. and after 3.00 p.m. so that he had to do his Arts course backwards.¹⁷ Fortunately, by the end of the century, such attitudes seem to have died out but while they lasted, the problem remained a bitter one for Laurie in particular.

At the same time his own appointment may well have provided reassurance for some churchmen, both in the Church of Scotland and on the more tolerant wing of the Free Church. He had for long been the secretary of the Established Church's Education Committee as well as the general overseer of that Church's actual training centres. Moreover in his speeches and writings on education he had continually emphasised the teacher's moral and religious responsibility for his pupils; so much so that one of his women students was later to ask herself after a lecture of his: "Who is sufficient for these things? (And), it was said, was supported by the unfaltering faith of the lecturer...inspired by ethical purpose."¹⁸ However the figure of Meiklejohn at St. Andrews was hardly quite so reassuring. Not only was he continually accusing the Church colleges of being narrow and mechanical in outlook, he was personally not the sort of figure usually sought out for posts of religious significance in Scotland. Indeed, he expressed his own astonishment at finding himself a professor of education.¹⁹ He had begun his career as a journalist, had been a war correspondent in the Prusso-Danish war and had been imprisoned in Russia on suspicion of Jewish espionage. The *Dundee Advertiser* had, during a parliamentary campaign described him as "a lively and well-painted butterfly"²⁰ and he was entertaining both as an actor and as an after-dinner speaker.²¹ He listed his hobbies in 'Who's Who' as "golf every morning, whist every evening and conversation when it can be had" - not a life-style likely to commend itself to every Presbyterian taste, although in fairness it could be

pointed out that he was a serious and distinguished scholar who had adverted to the importance of religious training at some length in his inaugural lecture.²²

However even in the case of Edinburgh there was no guarantee that once the chair had established itself Laurie would not be replaced by a more secular-minded figure and he himself was later conscious of antagonising some leaders in ecclesiastical circles by giving too ready an acceptance to the significance of physiologically based psychology in any analysis of the work of the teacher.

Such ecclesiastical concerns had of course been one of the bases of parliamentary opposition to the chairs even if West of Scotland churchmen had found allies in English sceptics. Yet there was a growing suspicion that the government's change of heart and swift capitulation to such a lobby had been motivated less by thus sharing the fears of the grant's opponents than by the seizing of a sudden opportunity to consolidate the government's growing vested interest in teacher-training. They were now increasingly to show themselves as more and more determined to exercise a rigid control over both entry to the teaching profession and the detailed form of training courses - at least so far as the Scottish public sector was concerned - so much so that no university could or would be prepared to operate within such constraints.

Laurie, in his inaugural, despite what he called "the evils of centralisation"²³ paid a tribute to Scottish centralised government for imposing compulsory teacher training on the system when it might well have rejected it on the same grounds that were now being adduced for rejecting educational studies elsewhere. Even so, if this were intended as a political gesture, intended to facilitate the acceptance of his own courses for certification, it certainly had no immediate success. The Scotch Education Department was quite determined to keep the recognised training procedures - at least for elementary teachers - firmly in its own hands, using both financial and administrative means.

Moreover Whitehall's apparent scepticism about a possible role for the universities in teacher-training was soon shown to be shared by many influential figures in the Scottish universities themselves – and not just in Glasgow. Several professors in their evidence to the University commissioners during 1877 either ignored the subject completely when drawing up lists of desirable developments or possible new chairs – at Glasgow and Aberdeen, for example – or gave it very low priority. Indeed, some poured sufficient scorn on the whole enterprise for the Commissioners finally to "refrain from making any special recommendation in regard" to this.²⁴ For while Young, the Natural History professor at Glasgow, though cool about chairs of education, suggested that all professors teaching school subjects should (in German style) include pedagogical issues in their courses,²⁵ Pirie, professor of Church History at Aberdeen, declared that the use of university chairs for the teaching of education was 'useless'. "You can never teach education in that way," he insisted.²⁶ Geddes, professor of Greek at Aberdeen, "had very grave doubts as to the possibility of making (such a chair) an efficient instrument in university education."²⁷ while Black, also of Aberdeen, though finding the idea of such a chair desirable, hastily added that he did not urge it so strongly; "we might make other arrangements for giving teachers a knowledge of method".²⁸

So that although many professors still supported the chairs, amid such dissension the government could well argue (and the point had played its part in the case of those whom Laurie termed the 'parliamentary philistines'²⁹ from the West of Scotland) that they could not accord formal recognition to Edinburgh and St. Andrews courses that were not available also in the other two universities. No national scheme was feasible that was based on a differential treatment of institutions. In this matter, as in so many others, they could divide and rule.

However struggles with government belonged to the future. The immediate worries of those universities with chairs were financial, for the endowments were still too low even to provide the professors with adequate salaries. As late as 1883 the

basic annual income of Meiklejohn's chair was only £133,³⁰ little more than an honours graduate could then expect in his first secondary school post.³¹ Of course the size of a Scottish professor's salary at this time depended to some extent on the number of students he could attract by his personal qualities and Laurie, who found himself good at this, valued the bond that this direct financial transaction created between professor and student,³² but he also assiduously attended any committee meeting where a possible increase in his salary was to be discussed³³ and no doubt found it more necessary to seek finance from other occupations than he would otherwise have done, thus limiting the time to be spent on specifically university duties.³⁴ Certainly, even in term time, Meiklejohn found it impossible to spend all his time in St. Andrews. In the mid-term month of February 1895 (even after his salary had been improved by an augmentation from the Bell fund which added £4,500 to the original amount of £6,000 in Edinburgh and a similar proportional amount of £3,000 in St. Andrews³⁵) he wrote to Patrick Geddes from the Authors Club in London of continuing financial problems: "I am so very busy trying to make some money...I have been expecting money for some time but it has not yet appeared."³⁶ When eventually with the coming of fixed salaries, each of them received £400 per annum, the endowment at St. Andrews still only yielded £223 of this and that at Edinburgh £361.³⁷ They could legitimately claim therefore that money problems had continually disturbed their work during most of their time in office.

At the same time the point must not be exaggerated. Their poverty was relative. Even in 1876 both of them had appreciable incomes from other sources. Both were successful writers and lecturers and did a great deal of the examining and inspecting that the new school boards had come to demand. The income from such sources, considerably increased once they had the title of professor, would probably have been the envy of many a professor of Humanity or Hebrew to whom similar paths for extra earnings were not open. Meiklejohn in particular had produced and continued to produce a whole range of school textbooks, many of which were included in what was

advertised as "the popular Professor Meiklejohn's series".³⁸ By 1894, for example his *New Geography* was in its 11th edition (6,500 copies), his *New History* in its 6th edition while his *Short Geography* had reached 60,000, to name but three from a wide array. Since 1855 Laurie had been salaried in his capacity as secretary of the Church of Scotland's Education Committee as well as secretary of each of its teacher training centres. Since 1856 he had drawn a salary as inspector for the Dick trustees³⁹ and since 1873 as secretary to the Endowed School Commission⁴⁰ while performing tasks also for the Heriot Trust and the Merchant Company of Edinburgh, just as Meiklejohn did for the Hutchison trust in Glasgow.⁴¹ Moreover it is clear that many of Laurie's regular Edinburgh University lectures were repeated for audiences outside, even as part of the regular timetables of other universities. Indeed, at Cambridge in the Easter Term of 1889, when the short, summerless academic year of Scotland was already at an end, certain Edinburgh lectures had been given a trial run.⁴² He was also a regular lecturer at the College of Preceptors during their London sessions. It is unlikely therefore that the under-endowment of the chairs caused either professor actual privation, though the need to perform all these extra tasks may sometimes have diverted their energies from the work of their chairs while giving them a greater sense of professional fulfilment.

Moreover it may well be that Laurie's deep involvement in general educational politics and in the work of the church colleges may have damaged the single-mindedness with which he first approached his university task. Those very qualities that made his appointment more acceptable to the Church may well have hampered him in subsequent disputes with government; for at committees and commissions he was often asked to speak not only on behalf of the universities but also on behalf of what was still seen as the rival college sector.⁴³ Usually he presented both cases fairly without appearing to compromise himself but on at least one occasion he seems to have been so incensed by a document that his church committee wished him to present on their behalf (it opposed a proposal to establish

teacher-training in Aberdeen University) that instead of signing it in his usual way, he described it simply as being "reported by S.S. Laurie".⁴⁴

At the same time such involvements and the fact that he lived in a large city with scores of schools and four training colleges meant that he never lacked professional contacts and conversation whereas Meiklejohn living in what was an extremely small town by any standards had continually to travel in search of such things. Laurie had a potential student body of many hundreds of undergraduates (even if they would need to be persuaded by certification). Meiklejohn's university usually had less than 300 students all told and even in nearby Dundee there was as yet no teacher-training centre to relate to. Not surprisingly therefore, he, more than most Professors in St. Andrews, greeted the founding of the new University college there.⁴⁵ Given the size of his first student body the university did not even bother to supply him with a classroom and for at least his first twenty years in office he had either to borrow a classroom or hold the lectures in his own drawing-room,⁴⁶ a cold shoulder explained in part perhaps by Fraser's evidence to the University Commissioners that non-graduating Chairs weakened all the other Chairs.⁴⁷ Yet with or without their colleagues' support both he and Laurie held on to their chairs for over a quarter of a century. Despite their financial difficulties and political failures they carved out such a role that in neither case did anyone question the wisdom of appointing a successor. They were to be remarkably effective holders of what were from the beginning purely experimental, even precarious Chairs.

Documentary evidence on why they were selected no longer appears to be extant. In the case of Edinburgh it has even been suggested that the originators of the Chair already had Laurie in mind. *La Grande Encyclopédie* describes it as having been fondée pour M. Laurie⁴⁸ but Paterson, rector of the Free Church college at Moray House, also let it be known that he was a candidate⁴⁹ while Bryce, as we have seen, actually published the references in support of his own candidature at a time when it seemed that the patronage was to be in Whitehall's hands. Whether a short leet

existed is not clear from either the Court or Senate minutes. Certainly Laurie's academic qualifications as a philosopher were impeccable as were those of Meiklejohn who had become a nationally known translator of Kant, while still a twenty-year old student.⁵⁰

How then did they both view their task as they took office? There can be no doubt that despite the role revisions of later years they saw their primary task, perhaps their sole task, as that of initial teacher-training in the fullest sense. Their inaugurals, delivered within a few days of each other in November 1876 (first by Laurie and then by Meiklejohn) were both concerned above all with the task of classroom teachers and any discussion of education systems, philosophy or history was conducted in relation to that. Laurie, in particular, insisted that, from the Chair, he lectured as an educationist rather than as philosopher, despite his international fame as the latter. They both wished to encourage more enlightened attitudes and better forms of pedagogy at all levels and were as interested in the work of the primary teacher as of the secondary, not sharing the view of Fitch that they should concentrate on the latter⁵¹ despite the fact, as Anderson indicates,⁵² that Laurie was concurrently "the real force" behind a new Association for Promoting Secondary Education in Scotland.

With suitable caution and out of deference to the Bell trustees' feelings they both made a formal genuflection in the direction of Andrew Bell to the propagation of whose theories they were committed by their deed of appointment which enjoined them to "advert to and fully explain the Madras or Monitorial system of School instruction introduced and advocated by Doctor Bell."⁵³ Laurie indeed referred to him, brushing aside the notion that the monitorial system was all he had offered the world, as "the founder of the Art of Primary Education in this country *as a conscious art*"⁵⁴ – a view scarcely shared by Scottish admirers of Stow and Wilderspin but given some credence by Pillans' use of Bell's methods during his time as a schoolmaster. But both quickly turned to other matters with Laurie spending some time deploying arguments

against opponents of the Chair and defending the validity of the notion of Education as a science, in such detail and to such effect indeed, that Meiklejohn was able to leave aside such matters and refer the still unconvinced to Laurie's arguments as fully reported in the Scottish press a few days earlier.⁵⁵

In the nineteenth century Meiklejohn's address with its many echoes of modern progressivism⁵⁶ has been praised as the better of the two. Rich (1933) for example, finds it "most interesting"⁵⁷ while Gordon in his collection of Education professors' inaugurals chooses it in preference to the Edinburgh one. Even so, Laurie's is possibly more important as an historical argument for he asserted firmly, for example, his view of the university as an institution in which the needs of the professions are paramount. The purely theoretical university, he asserted, has never existed, especially in Scotland⁵⁸ and defended Education against the charge that it was an immature science by reminding his audience that many other, perfectly respectable sciences could be attacked in the same way for being 'incomplete' - Botany, for example, which had still to develop beyond being a mere classificatory system.⁵⁹ As for Education not being an 'exact' science, neither was Ethics or Metaphysics, both eminently respectable but equally devoid of certainty,⁶⁰ while the very practicality of Educational Studies, always linked to the needs of the classroom, prevented them from becoming more 'windy talk'⁶¹ with no serious aim in view. "Education," he was later to assert, "had as much right (in the university) as the study of the crayfish or the making of engines".⁶²

When he turned more specifically to the world of the classroom, his views were ones just as likely as those of Meiklejohn to earn the epithet 'progressive' in the 1970s as in the 1870s.⁶³ Both acknowledged the limited role of formal educational syllabuses and schools when compared with that of the home and of peer groups⁶⁴ and both deplored the existence of the examination system with its encouragement of mere information-gathering and cramming, which made "the Book" one of the great enemies of Education for Meiklejohn. Laurie also drew attention to the neglect of

physiology as an element in the understanding of intelligence and discussed the relationship of physical characteristics and intellectual qualities⁶⁵ in a manner that might well have suited his successors' later debates about Moray House tests and Nature versus Nurture.

Certainly in neither case was there a hint of what through the writings of Dickens has become the stereotype of the Victorian educationist and his view of the child and society. If the attitudes of the Revised Code still dominated educational administration (and even that must now seem a dubious generalisation) it certainly received no encouragement from these pioneer academic constructors of a British 'science of education'. There are even moments when Laurie's insights anticipate those of the sociologists of knowledge a century later. His lifelong views, he was later to claim, went "right in the teeth of the attempts to turn our schools into ante-chambers of alkali works and engine shops".⁶⁶ Education, he said, "fitted children for freemen, not for factory slaves" and in a letter written to Patrick Geddes after his own retirement, he envisaged the creation of a truly open university system in which everyone could pursue their own intellectual development in perpetual symposia, free of timetables and all examinations.⁶⁷

However, once the Inaugurals had been delivered, the professors' organisational and political problems remained. It was one thing to hold exciting, modern views on teaching and quite another to attract students to voluntary classes that did not qualify for Arts graduation courses, classes, as one writer put it, that were mere *hors d'oeuvres* in the university curriculum.⁶⁸ They still had to persuade government that universities should be allowed to train teachers even for the secondary schools, and to persuade the churches that such an acceptance would not prove an unacceptable, even commercially disastrous breach of their monopoly as well as a threat to religion. Had the possibility of such university expansion into the training field not been envisaged, it is doubtful if the Bell offer would ever have been made or accepted in the first place for there was no great Scottish head of steam in favour of the purely

abstract development of a science of education as such.

It remains therefore to examine the efforts that were made during the remainder of the century to establish university-based teacher training in Scotland and to give the chairs in particular a clearer role.

The English training colleges of the time, largely developed by the church societies and influenced strongly by the ideas of Kay-Shuttleworth, saw their work, as we have seen, not just as the imparting of academic and classroom techniques but also the supervision of a whole range of personal developments believed to be necessary before the young teacher could be satisfactorily passed on to an employer. Given the working class or rural background of many pupil-teachers, these largely residential colleges aimed at 'gentling' their students and imposing table-manners, styles of dress and moral attitudes as much as academic knowledge and more efficient intellectual habits. To some extent the period in the college simply ensured that time passed safely, that maturation took place under controlled conditions and that those who came in as not very well-spoken children, became old enough and serious enough to command the respect of school boards, clergy and parents. Religion itself was continually emphasised, and, some modern historians would suggest, political quietism encouraged.⁶⁹

In Scotland on the other hand, though regular teacher training had already been in operation for half a century, its nature in 1876 was very different from that in England, at least so far as the students' personal lives were concerned. Above all, following the example of the two largest universities, the colleges were entirely non-residential. Indeed, Cruickshank suggests, church leaders, far from deploring the lessening of control that this involved, actually took pride in what they saw as a national tradition of non-residence, though it must be noted that, on occasions, such a pride had not prevented the universities' inability to provide moral supervision being used as an argument against their being allowed to enter the teacher-training field.

What Scotland provided therefore, was what in England was later to be called 'day training', a form that, as Laurie pointed out, must almost inevitably be more concerned with intellectual and technical training than with the general training of character and morals which, he felt, was beyond the scope of academic institutions⁷⁰ and while it is true that considerable time was spent in the training centres on religious matters and though the authorities interested themselves in the physical health and moral reputations of potential teachers, no Glasgow or Edinburgh institution, whether college or university, ever seriously claimed to be *in loco parentis* in the style of the Oxford, Cambridge and Durham colleges.

At the same time, the Scottish colleges - or training centres, or normal colleges, the names in the 1870s and 1880s still seem to have been interchangeable even in the same document - were all church establishments and Craik Secretary of the SED, was later to claim it as a rule that such church bodies alone were entitled to government recognition and support, even if he was later to be proved wrong and the rule a mere convention. Even so, although all the 1876 colleges were Church of Scotland, Free Church or Episcopalian, the government, for financial as much as for educational reasons, already had a considerable say in the running of them. The result was that even if the Education Professors were able to convince the churches and the colleges that they posed no threat and did not see themselves as rivals, they would still have to convince the SED and Treasury that government's own interest in maintaining the church monopoly should be ended.

At first the universities found the idea of rivalry difficult to understand. Laurie himself was part of the College world and in making their plans, he and Grant had been led to believe that in the wake of the 1872 Act the demand for trained teachers would be such that Government would be only too anxious to turn in a new direction for 1876 saw a major increase in the number of candidates seeking training.⁷¹ However they soon discovered that by what may well have been sleight of hand, the SED's annual report always managed to suggest that the current capacity of the

colleges under their control almost exactly matched or even slightly exceeded national need as established by the Scotch Code's criteria. Thus despite the increased demand, in the Blue Book for 1876-77 it is confidently asserted that 'the accommodation provided by the training colleges under inspection in Scotland is sufficient for 1042 students and that 1021 are now under instruction...we see no reason to doubt that the supply of teachers will before long be found sufficient to meet the needs of the country.'⁷² The vagueness of the last sentence disguised the toleration that was still being accorded to the untrained, especially to graduates, and for the remainder of the century the Department by such means (among others) could discourage the entry of new agencies to the state sector training field.

The teacher-training needs of Scotland were, however, to be defined by more than the English-style requirements of an extremely parsimonious Code and London-based Scotch Education Department. There were complex reasons why even government could not feel satisfied in Scotland with meeting the bare requirements of the elementary system, even if that might prove sufficient in England. There a Board School system that still lacked secondary or higher grade schools could for the time being seem satisfied with the low level intellectual fare provided by the residential colleges and the pupil teacher system, but in Scotland the state schools sector was concerned with more than elementary teaching. The 1872 Act had nationalised a system of schools some of which, like the High Schools of Edinburgh and Glasgow were secondary schools of excellence by international criteria. In addition there were other schools that to an English observer might have appeared "elementary", but which to the disgust of Lowe⁷³ were already involved in work which, south of the Border, would have been regarded as distinctly post-elementary teaching. In particular the School Boards had taken over responsibility for the Parochial Schools of both the main churches some of whose staff had at least some experience of university education. It was not unknown for such schools to be staffed by graduates, particularly in the North East, who could prepare pupils for university entrance, even

though their number was often exaggerated.

Thus there was a widespread national belief shared even by government officials, that at least some of the men under training (the Queen's Scholars) should receive more than a Training College education and that a university sector still capable of considerable expansion might well be paid to provide it.

This was not however the same thing as saying that their entire training should be handed over to the new Chairs, for even if large numbers of teacher trainees *were* admitted to Arts courses, that did not necessarily mean that they severed their links with the Colleges who might still claim the right to provide elements in the training experience that they believed (or suggested) the universities could never provide satisfactorily. If that claim were not accepted and more and more men aspired to graduation and training within the university then their future was seriously in jeopardy as they had realised in 1875. The legitimacy of that claim and the extent to which it could be defended now formed the basic issue on which the continuing struggle with the universities was to be fought for the next twenty years. This now became more important than the religious issue though it sometimes suited SED to replay the religious card in their general struggle to keep firm control of the main body of Scottish teacher-training.

One major cause of confusion for the modern student of such nineteenth century controversies is the fact that the term teacher-training is so often used in a far wider sense than is now customary. The recent habit of distinguishing 'teacher education' from 'teacher training' has given the latter the more limited meaning of mere technical training in the skills of the classroom or at best the practical application of the findings of various sciences to the school situation. For most Victorians, however, teacher training embraced the whole formal, educational experience of the teacher between his designation as a possible recruit (sometimes at a very early age under the pupil teacher scheme) to his actual entry to the profession as a salaried member.

Thus 'training' could include the taking of an honours degree just as much as the imbibing of a few tips from a supervising headmaster and even if the use of the term *were* restricted to the imparting of school-related science and skills, even this could embrace the academically high-level discussion of Philosophy, History and Psychology such as Laurie and Meiklejohn provided, just as readily as technical instruction in the completion of registers, the use of blackboards and slates and the skills required in entertaining inspectors.

It is always necessary therefore to determine what administrative or curricular arrangement is being discussed when a particular commission, committee or item of the code speaks of 'teacher training'.

In the period between 1873 and the nationalisation of the training colleges in 1905-06 numerous combinations of university and college training were tried or suggested. Some of these involved a combination of general university education (of the type provided in the Arts course, a type of general education which we can call G) with college-based technical, profession-orientated training in the widest sense (which we can call TT). Other arrangements involved a division of responsibility for both G and TT between university and college whereby the college provided an academically low level input of both. Typically, towards the end of the century, colleges provided graduates or potential graduates with what we can call g (instruction in subjects not provided by the university, such as singing, drawing, and drill) and t (tips for the classroom or supervised practice teaching). The holders of the chairs plus the university Lecturers in Education eventually appointed by Glasgow and Aberdeen, provided what we can call TP, profession-orientated studies of a high level philosophical, psychological and historical kind. TP might touch also on administrative issues, though these, like Psychology, could also figure, taught in a very primitive way, as part of t. Of these various elements the possible combinations were considerable and each of the following operated in at least one of the university centres during the thirty years covered by this chapter.

University	College
	G + TT
G + TT	
G followed by	TT
G concurrently with	TT
G TP followed by	tg
G TP concurrently with	tg
G followed by	tg
G concurrently with	tg
G tg	
G followed by TP and	tg

Such a table does not of course provide an exhaustive system of categories. It simply illustrates the wide range of possible combinations that were actually tried in late nineteenth century Scotland and make generalisations about teacher-training in this period almost impossible. To avoid the need of repeated definition, some use will be made of the same letter code (G, TT, TP, t, g) in subsequent sections.

However, another cause of complexity is the variety of influential groups usually involved in any public discussion of such issues. At the time the Chairs began to operate, all four universities had recently formulated a joint scheme for teacher-training which would involve a much increased role for their own institutions though in the light of subsequent debate and evidence it seems likely that the apparent unanimity of this proposal was deceptive, as certain terms such as 'teacher-training' itself were being interpreted differently in different universities, far more widely in St. Andrews, for example, than in Glasgow. The apparent unanimity was also in one sense a function of Laurie's chronic over-optimism and over-confidence in his own ability to manipulate church and government opinion.

On the other hand, all too often the four universities were divided in their interests

and tended to go their separate ways, and such a division could be and was continually exploited by government and particularly by Craik who continually exploited the universities' differences of size, facilities and opinion. The continuing division between the large and small universities was compounded by the equally great differences in potential school development and teacher demand in the four regions which differed widely both in population and the degree of urbanisation. Glasgow, for example, was at the centre of one of the most intensively urbanised areas of Europe, whereas Aberdeen was the sole large town in its entire region and while Edinburgh related to both industry and farming, its main preoccupation was with the three great professions of law, medicine and the ministry. The Court meetings at St. Andrews were often totally obsessed with the fabric of the farm-buildings which still brought them much of their income. Moreover, there was also a division of interest between those universities that already *had* a Chair of Education (one large and one small) and those that did not for St. Andrews and Edinburgh were bound to seek a solution to many of these problems more urgently and realistically than those universities which had no such under-used resource. Even so the two professors were often on opposing sides and the chairless universities rarely if ever acted together after the fruitless joint-four approaches of the 1870s. Aberdeen, unlike Glasgow, was always willing and anxious to establish a chair but lacked the finance and governmental encouragement and it appeared that for them it was immaterial that Education was still excluded from the graduating syllabus. Glasgow on the other hand, showed its usual reluctance to establish any chair that did not guarantee a ready audience and the absence of Education from the compulsory Arts programme was a commercially disheartening factor.

Moreover, Aberdeen, despite its 'small' status, was nevertheless a major provider of recruits to the teaching profession (in England as well as Scotland) on a scale out of all proportion to its size. Indeed, this question of size could be misleading. Principal Donaldson of St. Andrews was later to point out that though small and

isolated by Scottish standards, St. Andrews had an Arts faculty as large and prosperous as that of many famous German universities, including Tübingen and Jena, both world famous for their educational studies, while it was actually larger than that in any of the universities of Switzerland,⁷⁴ a country sending a higher proportion of her population to university than even Scotland did. Moreover, the *proportion* of her resources devoted to the Arts faculty, however relatively small in Scottish terms, compared favourably with that of Edinburgh with its concentration on medicine and law and this seemed to suggest the desirability of a closer link with the teaching profession for which so great a proportion of her graduates were destined.

Thus the approach of each university to the teacher-training question and to government varied considerably and the large/small division in particular was to widen as government provided the finance to enable more and more male college students to enter the large universities in search of G during the 70s and 80s.

Meiklejohn's position on all these issues seems to have remained single-minded. He was in favour of university training, full G and TT, for both primary and secondary teachers. He regarded college training as inferior⁷⁵ and limited both spiritually and intellectually by the narrowness of their remit.⁷⁶ He therefore hoped that the Universities' role in TT could be consistently enlarged. Laurie however was far less fixed in his opinions, perhaps because of his partial commitment to the college sector. He also could attack the state's attempts to monopolise the training of "students who had only received the benefit of a narrower and illiberal course of training based on an English model"⁷⁷ and appeared in his Inaugural, despite his friendly gestures to the colleges, to be advocating widespread transfer of prospective teachers to the university sector for both G and TT, his argument being that "if the Training Colleges are competent to handle the question of Education as a science and art equally well with the Universities, they are (by that token) also competent to teach classics, science and philosophy equally well with the Universities" - a patent nonsense to his audience. "What we want is that the student teacher shall live in the university

atmosphere, and enjoy all those subtle intellectual and moral advantages which belong to that serener air",⁷⁸ though in his evidence to the Commissioners in the following year it emerged that he felt such exclusively university training was only possible for an elite and that colleges would always be necessary "for three-quarters of the future teachers of the country".⁷⁹ Both were agreed, however, that there was a training task for the universities to perform.

Even so, though much of the next thirty years was dominated by the attempts of the universities to persuade government to grant them a bigger share in the market, it would be wrong to think of the Colleges as mere passive spectators of a developing situation, waiting to discover what role government or university would finally assign to them. After all it was reputedly the vested interests of the college sector that had persuaded government to refuse augmentation of the endowments of the chairs, and there still remained considerable political support for their position both from those who feared the supposed dangers posed to religion and those who felt that the considerable financial investment by government in the housing and equipping of the colleges should not now be under-used.

Some college heads were clearly jealous of their monopoly. Leitch, Rector of the Established Church College in Glasgow for example, in his report to the General Assembly of 1875 had laid out the wide range of high-level theoretical studies presented to his students, studies, he claimed, that had "not been suggested by the recent outcry ... - an ignorant outcry so far as this Training Centre is concerned - but have been carried out during the whole period of my principalship".⁸⁰ On the other hand it must be emphasised that not all or even most of the opposition in 1875 had come from the colleges as such. Certainly some in that sector opposed the chairs but Leitch's successor Ross had been and continued to be one of their most fervent advocates. He, in fact, was a man of wide horizons who was also a member of the Convocation of London University, and was, in 1883, to publish a major defence of university studies in Education and their expansion.⁸¹ Far more active in opposition

than the college teachers themselves were the convenors of certain church committees and their friends.⁸² One must therefore distinguish between such church politicians and the new type of teacher in the college sector who was motivated less by religion than by the professional concerns of an ever more sophisticated educational world under American and German influence.

It is true that the church politicians still ostensibly controlled such figures but with the secularisation of the schools in 1872, the establishment of the School Boards and the development of an ever stronger SED, the churches themselves were playing an increasingly smaller role in the affairs of their own major colleges and of teacher-training generally. By 1892 Donaldson was able to claim that even the financial commitment of the churches was virtually at an end. Indeed, the Free Church Presbytery in Aberdeen, he reminded the Commissioners, had voted in favour of abandoning control of their colleges, as had the Established Church Presbytery in St. Andrews⁸³ while the denominational differences in the day to day working of the Presbyterian colleges were largely disappearing.⁸⁴ Had this not been so then the nationalisation of the colleges in 1905-06 would have been a considerably more painful process, given parliament's current sensitivity to the denominational controversies that bedevilled educational development elsewhere in the United Kingdom.

The truth was that by 1890 the SED and the inspectorate, the financial controllers, had become the chief decision-makers with regard to the running and functions of the colleges. Any church interest was now largely limited to the making of appointments and to the training of students for the specifically religious elements in the curriculum.

It was clear, therefore, as early as 1876 that the most formidable obstacle to any extension of the universities' role in TT as opposed to G remained not so much the churches or their colleges as the officials of the SED, the civil servants, that is, as

opposed to the Inspectorate, whose views were many and varied and who, in Jolly, had produced a champion of university involvement. The success of that venture was now seen to depend more and more on the ability of Professors and Principals to persuade the SED's Secretaries, who in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, were to have a more decisive role and even a higher profile than their ostensible masters in the Cabinet. Laurie, building on his earlier work, had a good working relationship with Sandford, the first secretary of SED,⁸⁵ but Sandford's successors, Craik and Struthers, were harder nuts for the professors to crack. Both clearly believed that the primary issue was not one of academic standards or educational philosophy, though they no doubt, as civilised men, accorded some importance to such issues; the primary issue was rather that of who should control entry to the profession and the content of TT.

Most of all, Craik concentrated on the technical difficulties of making an investment of state finance in university TT.⁸⁶ When G alone was required it could be bought from the universities in a normal commercial manner but any attempt by government to invest in technical training on lines similar to those followed in the case of the colleges was very much more complicated and indeed might prove impossible. There was, for example, the difficulty of detaching the below-the-line expenditure incurred on t and g from that incurred on general university activity, a problem that did not arise in specialist colleges. There was also the more general difficulty of allowing for TT activities in the arrangement of general grants to universities and particularly formidable difficulties arose from the existence of an accountants' fiction invented by Whitehall to compensate for the fact that training colleges in England were residential whereas those in Scotland were not. Under what Craik himself called 'this curious arrangement' fictitious amounts of £23 for every male and £14 for every female could be added to the nominal expenses of the training colleges, nominal expenses that had themselves become something of an accounting fiction as Donaldson was fond of demonstrating. It was always difficult for the

layman to deal with such technical points or even to understand them, and time after time Craik was able to make impatient university opponents seem foolish, simply because they had never had access to certain treasury documents or experience of public finance. In the face of such a formidable opponent, the universities found themselves having to look for stronger, more technical arguments for acquiring TT. The rhetoric of earlier decades no longer had sufficient vigour.

During the parliamentary fight against the founding of the chairs great emphasis had been placed on the religious element in teacher-training. After 1876 emphasis was also laid on the technical training and teaching practice element in training that, it was said, colleges alone could satisfactorily provide.⁸⁷ Again and again Laurie and Meiklejohn had to answer the charge that they had no prospect of a school in which to carry out such training and some attempt to use ordinary Edinburgh schools for these purposes met in the beginning at any rate with only limited success. More and more a distinction came to be made between the role of the university as a provider of G and of the college as provider of TT. It was a distinction easily accepted by those Edinburgh professors who had simply seen the Chair as a way of attracting more students but something of a disappointment to those who felt that the pursuit of TT within the university could give it a broader aspect with a greater emphasis on TP and could be conducted in a more enlightened atmosphere than that currently thought to be prevailing in the colleges.

One particular complaint against the colleges was their lack of curricular freedom. It was not unknown for government officials, already responsible for the college syllabus and examinations, to interfere directly in the teaching process and the choice and use of texts. Circular 183 of 1880, for example, expressed the wish that Locke's 'Thoughts' should be given especial emphasis as these "are of a practical nature and largely applicable to the conduct of public elementary schools; and the lecturer is not fettered by any particular psychological system."⁸⁸ Officials were generally cautious about the introduction of Psychology into the colleges. It was not until 1882 that it

actually appeared in the examined syllabus and it seemed quite clear that no university department intending to prepare students independently for a government certificate would be prepared or expected to subject itself to such detailed external supervision. Even so, the advocates of university involvement consistently underestimated official caution.

Already in 1873, as we have seen, a small scale scheme had been begun whereby the most promising candidates for certification by the colleges had been allowed to seek part of G within a local university and in 1875 all four universities had joined in the framing of the joint-four plan which to the outsider might have seemed an innocuous plan for linking colleges and three of the universities in a joint venture and for providing a small all-university scheme in St. Andrews. In the event, however the Blue Book reaction was courteous but remarkably dismissive. "The object of this scheme deserves every encouragement but some of the details will require further and very careful consideration before they are finally agreed to...(for) we hold it essential that we should continue to secure for the young men of 18 to 20 years of age, who may be qualified for entry to the universities the advantages of that careful supervision and practical preparation for their future duties now afforded by the training colleges which is necessary to retain general confidence in the moral and religious character as well as the intellectual proficiency of those who aspire to employment as the future teachers of the children of the country."⁸⁹

This was to continue to be the official attitude: that in some way the close personal supervision of students by the college (under SED control) must be maintained even though teachers in training tended to be older than many of the ordinary "unsupervised" matriculated students with whom they might mix in university classes.

Even so Laurie remained confident that the four universities' scheme could eventually succeed and he remained confident in his own ability to sort things out

satisfactorily. In his work for the Church and the Trusts his schemes had usually been accepted and now that his status had been raised by his becoming a professor in the largest university, he was sure that even government must accept the common sense of his proposals. He undertook personally the supervision of the proposed arrangements not merely in Edinburgh but also in St. Andrews where, wearing his church hat, he succeeded in arranging the possibility of a Madras College master becoming a substitute Master of Method in the absence of a local college. St. Andrews was, however less enthusiastic than he was. There can be no doubt that Meiklejohn wanted to be his own Master of Method and could not square Laurie's assumption that a college or other outsiders must be involved with the notion of independent university training. "Of course" Laurie was to say later in one of his all too common bursts of petulance, "there were very few men there who understood the details of these questions and the present Professor (Meiklejohn) would not take it up because he did not see that it was likely to be a success and it would have been a very small matter for a time."⁹⁰

In fact the *matter* throws an interesting light on the continuous ambiguity of Laurie's attitude to the colleges and the confusion of his university and college roles. His presence in both camps made it sometimes difficult for him to understand the anxieties and suspicions of those who did not enjoy what Ramsay called Laurie's 'exceptional position'⁹¹ which could make him *persona grata* in circles not necessarily open to representatives of the other universities. However on this occasion he did *not* carry all before him and two years later the 1878 Blue Book in reporting the final rejection of the universities' joint scheme was to deploy fresh arguments against the whole idea. SED now believed that an entry into the market by the universities must damage the colleges by creaming off their *elite* (the actual word used) and would "render useless much of the large expenditure which has been contributed by the public funds and voluntary promoters of education in Scotland towards the foundation of these colleges",⁹² an argument often to be used during the next thirty years. To

these were added two further arguments: that the churches might actually be completely driven out of the education field by such competition and (a strange argument from a United Kingdom government) that funds meant for Scottish use might end up training teachers destined for England.⁹³

The danger of removing the colleges' elite was the one that could be most easily avoided by adopting proposals from HMI Wilson for shared training⁹⁴ and by expanding the 1873 scheme of entry to university Arts classes. The immediate result was a considerable and accelerating increase in the attendance of college students at Glasgow and Edinburgh universities,⁹⁵ though in the absence of male colleges in St. Andrews and Aberdeen the new scheme proved in their case abortive.

By 1880 the scheme in the two main cities was going so well that Wilson, the Inspector of Colleges, in his annual report, was even able to forecast what were to be later demands for the full incorporation of the colleges into the universities⁹⁶ and for 1884 reported that "the higher and broader culture of the university ... is thus gradually leavening the mass of the elementary teachers".⁹⁷ Other inspectors were sufficiently enthusiastic about the scheme to make what was to become an annual and eventually successful appeal for students to be allowed to add a third session to the two then allowed so that they could consider graduation.⁹⁸

Even so the effects of the scheme on Aberdeen and St. Andrews were actually negative, for not only did it enlarge the financial gap between the small and large universities, it actually meant that potential teacher students were likely to be attracted to Glasgow and Edinburgh from the smaller cities and the possibility of subsidised university education was now drawing into the Edinburgh and Glasgow colleges students who might well have previously scorned such impersonal institutions or preferred to stay nearer home. Far from destroying a college elite, the new scheme was actually helping to create one. The intellectual cream of the North East was more and more being drawn into the colleges of the Central Belt and their

concurrent university courses.

In 1884 the Aberdeen Senate, under the strong influence of Donaldson, now a Professor there, proposed that as there was no male college for them to damage, they should now independently seek permission to provide 'all the elements' of full teacher training on the same financial basis as a college.⁹⁹ In a letter to the Privy Council, noting the support of the local EIS, they expressed their willingness to go to the expense of endowing a Chair or Lectureship in education and to make "other such provision as their Lordships might deem necessary" including possibly the provision of an as yet non-existent summer session. They suggested that if they were given the same support as the churches that were currently running the colleges they might even provide something a little better including the graduation of all teachers for primary as well as secondary schooling.¹⁰⁰

This offer was refused, however, in much the same terms as the one of 1875. In particular it was again emphasised that universities could not provide adequate moral supervision for intending teachers, though, as usual, Craik added further novel arguments: that college students could more easily be held to the promise to serve in schools than could university graduates (hardly an argument which squared with the Department's current policy of encouraging college students to graduate in the larger universities) and that as the number of students to be trained in the whole of Scotland was now being limited to 800, the allocation of a portion of these to Aberdeen University might well reduce the Edinburgh and Glasgow colleges' allocations to an uneconomic size.¹⁰¹ However in the following year the Department did make one concession by permitting the transfer of a small number of local males hitherto destined for the larger cities to the female college in Aberdeen so that they could attend Arts classes in Aberdeen University on the same basis as elsewhere.¹⁰² Even so, all this was a disappointment for Donaldson and his committee who had not only developed their ideas in convincing detail but had actually persuaded the Endowed School Commission to allocate to them a whole institution for use as a

normal school.

The next year, in 1885, it was St. Andrews' turn to take the initiative in a letter from Principal Tulloch and Meiklejohn,¹⁰³ which did not so much ask permission to undertake training as actually announce that the university proposed "to make arrangements for the adequate education and training both of primary and secondary teachers". The letter as a whole had a breezy, almost belligerent air, suggesting that it came from the pen of Meiklejohn himself, though in this matter he certainly had the backing of the Senate and of the General Council.¹⁰⁴ "At present primary teachers are trained in our Normal Schools", the Tulloch-Meiklejohn letter asserted but "the work done there could be better done in the university *and at a lower cost*" This the writers estimated at 60% of normal though they did not give details, and proposed not merely a course of lectures but a full programme of t and g, summer sessions etc. and had clearly taken on board many of the objections made by SED to earlier plans.

Stung perhaps by the letter's tone, Craik in his prompt reply¹⁰⁵ dropped much of the courtesy of his earlier reactions to university overtures, pointing out with little delicacy that the whole town of St. Andrews could boast no more than one post-infant school of 204 pupils (Madras College)¹⁰⁶ so that little in the way of teaching practice could be offered there, and went on to question the whole basis of the university's claim, pointing out in addition that there were already more than enough male training places in Scotland, that no evidence had been presented to back the claim that they could reduce costs by 40% and that, as for the idea of training secondary teachers, the high salaries that such teachers would eventually command should in themselves be enough of an inducement to them to pay for their own university education without becoming a charge on the government, though in fairness to Meiklejohn, he had never suggested that courses for secondary teachers should necessarily be subsidised at all. He had merely announced that he would provide such courses, as yet unknown in Scotland.

In fact the mind of the SED was by no means as closed on the subject of secondary training as their curt letter may have suggested and the 1886 Blue Book returned to the subject, noting that "various suggestions whereby the training (of secondary teachers) might be approved, have been made to us and are receiving careful consideration."¹⁰⁷ There can be little doubt that at least some if not all of these emanated from the two Professors who were even then teaching students already in or destined for secondary posts and there can be little doubt that both of them saw in this as yet undeveloped field great new scope for their chairs. Moreover it was a field in which the churches had no vested interest and in which recruitment for training was not subject to the quota system now so often used as an excuse for keeping universities out of the elementary teacher training field.

However, although secondary training was eventually to become without difficulty a major and natural activity of the English universities, things in Scotland were never so easy. Craik apparently decided once more to draw attention to university heterogeneity in order to slow down this new development before something so new and untried escaped completely from SED supervision. He suggested that the awarding of such a national task as secondary training to the university sector might prove more difficult than at first appeared as "the Scottish university curriculum may be about to become less uniform"¹⁰⁸ (presumably referring to potential changes eventually wrought by the Act of 1889) while Wilson used another old argument to slow the movement down. He admitted that in so far as lectures can train, Laurie (and presumably Meiklejohn) was already training graduates for secondary teaching with great skill, but when this was conceded, nothing further could be claimed by the friends of the university. "As well might they attempt to teach the art of swimming without water, as to impart the practice of teaching without a properly equipped practising school."¹⁰⁹ Next year in his last report before his death he was even to suggest that such a school must have 1,000 pupils,¹¹⁰ something clearly that might be beyond the means even of Edinburgh and Glasgow universities, let alone St. Andrews

- and one must doubt whether it was within the means of most of the Colleges either.

Even so, Laurie as well as Meiklejohn was determined to go ahead with secondary training. He was concerned not merely with spreading university TP more widely among teachers in general, but also with ending the situation whereby graduates with no college experience could still, under the Scotch Code, begin work in public schools with a quite inadequate exposure to educational studies - with a smattering of t at most and probably no experience of TP at all. During 1885 therefore he persuaded his own university to institute the following year a Schoolmaster's Diploma for graduates which, he hoped, would increasingly be demanded by employers. The institution of this Diploma, the first Diploma of any kind in Edinburgh University,¹¹¹ was possible under the old 1858 Act and required no government approval, though he naturally hoped that the SED would eventually accord it some form of recognition. Candidates had not merely to be graduates and to have attended his own lecture course. They must also have either taught successfully and publicly for a year in school, attended t and g courses in a college or gained the qualification in the practice of teaching demanded in the Code though the latter was not necessarily a very exacting demand, judging from the experience of Boyd quoted earlier. Moreover Laurie himself was to be satisfied with their performance in some local school under his own supervision. The Diploma was to be therefore no mere academic qualification such as the twentieth century Edinburgh Diploma in Education eventually became and at least some partnership with the colleges was almost always envisaged. He himself saw it, *inter alia*, as a way of ensuring that an MA who had attended his class would be likely to end up as more than a mere assistant teacher. This Diploma was to be a certificate of a higher kind, a qualification for headships, though he also speculated on whether a combination of the Diploma with an experimental lower level Arts qualification (LA - Licentiate in Arts¹¹²) might not form a suitable professional qualification for the intellectually less able or the poverty stricken, a substitute for the revived Scottish BA

for the establishment of which, as a teacher's degree, many, including Meiklejohn himself, had been calling earlier.¹¹³

Far more important than the Schoolmaster's Diploma, however, was the increasing friendly intercourse between the colleges and universities and the new dilemmas over secondary training demanded some official stocktaking. In 1887 therefore, an *ad hoc* body, the Parker Committee, was appointed by the Secretary for Scotland to examine the situation. The report published in 1888¹¹⁴ simply confirmed official policy and was glowing in its praise for the colleges. The control of elementary training was to remain firmly in their hands as well as the provision of t and g for those concurrently attending university and while elements of TT might well be provided for Diplomates in the universities, especially in the form of TP, such Diplomas were not to be insisted upon in public sector schools, where any recognised teaching qualification must still contain an element of college or college supervised training.

Parker repeated the well rehearsed arguments against purely university training – lack of moral supervision, lack of practice schools etc. but to these were now added one which became increasingly popular even with Laurie: that a strong college sector must be maintained for those who could not achieve admission to university classes i.e. the intellectually inferior males, as well as the many women who were now forming an increasing proportion of the teaching profession.¹¹⁵

Constructive evidence on possible local innovations given by each of the universities, was largely ignored by the committee which still seemed determined to impose, insofar as was possible a common pattern on all four. Any attempt to meet previous points made by SED seem to have been largely ignored. For example, Donaldson who had now arrived in St. Andrews from Aberdeen on his appointment as Principal of the United College, attempted in a letter of January 1887, included in the evidence, to answer most of the points made by Craik against the St. Andrews proposals of 1885.¹¹⁶ So far as moral supervision was concerned, their small

university had already been approved by the India Office as a suitable residential place of study because of the degree of personal supervision that the professors could provide in such a miniature and remote community. He pointed out also that far from being remote from the classroom, their Professor of Education was nationally accepted as a lecturer "on method and methods in primary as well as in secondary subjects", while through their experience of providing their external award for women, the LLA, the St. Andrews staff had a particular knowledge of female education unequalled in the other universities. But such arguments had no effect on a committee largely committed to the *status qua*.

One remarkable aspect of the Parker Committee's proceedings was the almost perfunctory nature of the EIS's involvement. The Institute produced a mere sixty words in reply to an invitation to offer "any remarks which they may desire to make on the necessity of the special training of teachers and on the means at present employed for the purpose in Scotland." In their "remarks"¹¹⁷ they merely viewed with satisfaction "the growing connexion (sic) between the training colleges and the universities" and hoped that this would develop in order to give future teachers "the best fruits of both systems" which suggests that the notion of a Faculty of Education was now taking a different shape in the mind of EIS policy-makers. Clearly, at least some members of the organisation that had long campaigned for the Chairs was not so interested in their function now that university attendance, bringing with it long sought social and academic status, was so widespread among recruits to the profession.

Laurie in his evidence was also far more positive in his assigning of a future role to the colleges in the training of graduates than he had been in his Inaugural and his evidence to the university commission a decade earlier. If all the Normal School students entered the Arts Faculty, he suggested, it would itself become a mere Normal School.¹¹⁸ Again he was unsupportive of Meiklejohn, dismissing the St. Andrews proposition that a greater use of universities for TT might lead to

economies.¹¹⁹ This he did in a direct answer to Craik, who held the strong position of an assessor to the Committee and who must have known what answer to expect, for, of course, any admission that universities could have done the job more cheaply would have thrown in question Laurie's stewardship as the national administrator of three of the colleges. In fact, however, Laurie went further and in a remarkable piece of evidence suggested that to increase the universities' role in TT would actually cost the government more, for no university would be willing to contribute the 25% of expenditure that fell to the churches, a payment which Donaldson in his 1892 evidence was to claim had become a mere accountancy fiction.¹²⁰ We must conclude therefore that Laurie was either misleading the committee, was financially naive over a point on which his evidence did the St. Andrews case considerable damage, or actually wished to damage Meiklejohn.

In fact the latter could well have argued that given his university's dire financial straits, he and his professorial colleagues would have been only too willing to offer attractive rates to the government and its sponsored students. Unlike those of Glasgow and Edinburgh, their Arts classes were not already crowded and they could have taken up considerable slack with very little extra expenditure.

Laurie's evidence must presumably be seen within a strategy that inevitably involved the conciliation of Craik in the interests of the Edinburgh plans and the Schoolmaster's Diploma¹²¹ and the distancing of himself from what might well have seemed the wild plans of St. Andrews, accompanied as they usually were by sweeping attacks on the colleges, by colourful behaviour and language from Meiklejohn and unsupported financial assertions.¹²² Certainly his evidence to Parker helped to entrench the notion of a university/college partnership as a national ideal. So far as the work of the Chair was concerned, he seems at this stage to have concentrated his efforts on gaining acceptance of the Schoolmaster's diploma and the need for a proper qualification for graduate teachers in the higher grade and independent schools. Yet speaking in England (for example in Liverpool four years later) he still

dismissed the notion that college participation in graduate training was necessary.¹²³ Only when the SED and the Church of Scotland were listening, perhaps, did he make much of it.

The two small universities, however, could gain nothing by making such a concession and Aberdeen hankered in particular after a larger share of the concurrent students, complaining that far too many students from the North-East were still being tempted to Edinburgh and Glasgow when they would far rather have stayed at home.¹²⁴ In the circumstances therefore they would still prefer to embark on a full programme of G and TT with no dependence on college participation. Indeed they agreed with Parker's own suggestion that it was the poor reputation of Aberdeen college tuition that might be acting as a deterrent to those potential Aberdeen students who still insisted on attending the four large city colleges.¹²⁵

In St. Andrews the confidence of Donaldson and Meiklejohn was for the time being increased by a new set of negotiations concerning possible activities in Dundee which, if successfully concluded, would possibly provide the university with new scope both for student recruitment and for teaching practice. Meiklejohn had always believed in such a development and with the opening of both a small English-style university college there and the new Tay Bridge it would even be possible for Professor and/or students to commute between the two centres. When Donaldson and Principal Peterson of Dundee indicated to Parker that they had a long-term plan in mind for the establishment of an English-style Day Training College in Dundee, to be run in conjunction with St. Andrews and that it could operate on the same basis as the state's previous arrangements with the churches, Parker reminded him that the current arrangements with the Churches were such as to give government some control of the training, but Donaldson was already able to point to growing parliamentary support for independent university training in England and, flushed with new confidence, Meiklejohn again had none of Laurie's inhibitions about attacking what he still saw as the 'mechanical' nature of college training.¹²⁶ He himself would be the

rector in full control of any centre that St. Andrews might establish, hardly a welcome assertion to Parker or Craik, though there was a not unnatural official welcome for his other suggestion that the university should lengthen its working year and thus avoid 'a waste of plant' (perhaps the first British use of such a phrase in such a context).¹²⁷ With this in mind, he suggested a novel programme of summer sessions for women teachers whose winter studies might be conducted in the larger cities and eventually not only were such summer sessions at St. Andrews eventually instituted to more and more important popularity¹²⁸ but St. Andrews also became a great centre of female teacher education. In the next few years there were even personal suggestions from Parker for an actual College in St. Andrews to be paid for by the Barry Bequest but nothing came of that idea.¹²⁹

As for Glasgow, their ambitions continued to be limited. For the moment they were content profitably to attract teacher trainees to the Arts classes and this appeared to be the only end that their own new teachers' diploma was intended to serve.¹³⁰ As their Professor Jack put it, "In the work of practical training, the normal colleges do what the universities could not very well do,"¹³¹ and his awareness of such Glasgow caution may well have provided Laurie with another reason for pursuing his own cautious policy. The relations of both large universities with their colleges were exceptionally good by 1890 and participation in concurrent courses, far from being seen as the robbery of an *élite*, was now actively encouraged by most College Principals, though, as we noted earlier, some laid down conditions designed to remind students that their first loyalty was to the College.

Meanwhile St. Andrews continued to pursue its Dundee schemes. The Universities Act of 1889 had made various arrangements "if and when the said college shall be affiliated to and made to form part of the university" and what Cant has called the "Dundee Movement"¹³² became inextricably linked with the plans of Donaldson and Meiklejohn. 1890 saw not only a renewal of their campaign but a real attempt by Donaldson at instigating a root-and-branch reform of the whole training system,

including the incorporating of all the training centres into the universities. Accordingly the Blue Book spoke of proposals from St. Andrews "which would largely alter the relations of the state to the training of teachers". These were attacked not merely by Parker but by the editor of the EIS's journal which accused Donaldson of trying to get his hand into the till¹³³ and were apparently repulsed with no great effort by the SED who did however note that the scheme for concurrent G and TT elsewhere had been given a further boost.

1. by the granting of the long-awaited right of a third session to the most promising university students (thus increasing the possibility of more widespread teacher graduation)
 2. by the promise of a sudden influx of women to the scheme, following their admission to university matriculation
- and
3. by the plans for a Catholic college in Glasgow to serve a hitherto untrained teaching force.

These three developments were in themselves sufficiently far-reaching to occupy the close attention of SED and treasury for some years while the far from smooth early years of the St. Andrews/Dundee merger and the changes resulting from the 1889 Universities Act were to preoccupy the university protagonists.

Nevertheless in 1895 what appeared to be a major change of attitude on the part of the SED to the whole question of the universities and teacher-training did reveal itself in a Circular relative to the Code of that year, which, twenty years earlier, might have seemed a natural response to the founding of the chairs but could hardly have been expected by anyone who had since then confined his reading to the intervening Blue Books and the official evidence to Parker.

Kerr suggests that such a change resulted from "a gradual liberalizing of the Department's methods"¹³⁴ and this may be so but it may just as easily have been an admission that at long last Craik proved to have an Achilles heel; namely his inability

to gainsay the parallels being more and more actively drawn between the position of University College, Dundee and that of the English University colleges, recently given the authority to set up government-financed Day Training departments.

Hitherto Anglo-Scottish differences had usually presented SED with a welcome justification for pursuing a line of its own - for example in its method of financing colleges or over the providing of a far richer G curriculum for Scottish teacher trainees than was usually provided in England. Vague appeals to the dominie tradition had been used to justify the purchase of G in the university sector at a time when similar expenditure in England, had it even been envisaged, would almost certainly have been vetoed by a department where the principles of Lowe still had considerable force. Such gestures by SED proved popular in Scotland, not least in the large universities, and Craik could therefore pose as a defender of national tradition.

But, by an irony this lavish provision of G to Scottish male teachers caught the imagination of English observers, and, under the guidance of Laurie,¹³⁶ who bearing the prestige of his chair, had become president of the London-based Teachers' Guild, an English lobby was able to persuade government there of the advantages both of Scottish non-residential training and the involvement of the universities in the training process.¹³⁷ The fact that in Scotland that university involvement was restricted to the provision of G seems to have been lost sight of, possibly because there simply were no English day colleges available to supplement university courses with t and g. As a result the new Day Training Colleges which emerged in England were not only integral parts of the new university colleges that had been springing up in large industrial cities, they were also entirely independent providers of TT, dependent in no way on the services of church or government colleges. Yet they were fully recognised and supported financially by the state.

The result in Scotland was unexpected. The Day Training movement had been seen as a belated and attractively cheap attempt by the English to catch up with what

was happening north of the Border. However in St. Andrews things were seen somewhat differently. Through having no local college they had even been excluded from the profitable market in G for teacher-trainees, let alone TT. Now they had the new link with Dundee's University College which with its similarity in foundation and aims to the university colleges in Leeds, Liverpool and elsewhere, might provide an appropriate home for a Scottish Day-Training College planned on English lines. Once established, it would also set a new precedent in Scotland so far as the government's financing of independent university teacher-training was concerned, and the way might even be open for St. Andrews University to bring forward another scheme of her own for St. Andrews itself whereby her Chair of Education could at last be used effectively.

In 1892-3, the University Commissioners, at the request of a more sympathetic government, re-examined the apparently rejected 1890 proposals from St. Andrews/Dundee. The number of witnesses they called were far fewer than on similar previous occasions - Craik himself, Kerr (the Inspector of Colleges), Donaldson, Laurie and Ramsay from Glasgow, with Donaldson, as a result of his earlier history, apparently acting as a spokesman for Aberdeen as well as St. Andrews.¹³⁷

The English parallel with Dundee was a strong one and the proposal itself was one that even Craik found difficult to oppose.¹³⁸ It was clearly feasible financially, the old religious and moral objections seemed no longer to apply and it did not even pose a threat to local college viability as there *were* no rival colleges in either Fife or Angus. Craik was therefore forced back on to the old but very weak argument that only churches were allowed to administer state-aided teacher-training in Scotland. There was however no statutory or Code backing for such an assertion. The arrangement with the churches had simply been a natural arrangement before 1872 when the churches had also controlled most of the schools. It was a convention in no way binding on an educational system under secular control and indeed an unchallenged, if ambiguous clause in the Parker report had suggested that any body could undertake

teacher-training if they satisfied official requirements.

However, the game was not yet up and Craik again found a temporary ally in Laurie whose apparently total conversion to the idea of a university/college partnership now became manifest. He expressed a conviction that a totally new chapter had opened in Scottish education and positively rejected the St. Andrews plan, though he admitted that he might well have supported it some years earlier (not a view supported by his Parker evidence). The change had come about, he believed, as a result of the institution of the University Preliminary exam, which would greatly restrict the intake and raise the quality of teacher-trainees seeking G. Moreover, because of the new Fee-fund arrangements, professors would now be less interested in attracting hordes of inferior college students to augment their income. But, above all, a new challenge had been posed for the teacher-training system by changes in the school system itself and while an English-style, independent scheme of university-based training might be *feasible* in Scotland, it was, he believed, no longer *desirable*,¹³⁹ for he believed that the decision of SED to establish many more higher class schools and secondary schools of a lower rank (i.e. what he called Central Schools, below the academic level of the Royal High School or Dundee Academy) meant that a whole new task had opened up for Professors of Education organising Diplomas similar to his, and to turn a fine old university like St. Andrews into a mere replica of a Training College would now be a retrograde step.¹⁴⁰

There must of course be considerable doubt about the extent to which his conversion was the Road to Damascus affair he claimed it to be. Much of his negative evidence is in line with what he had said to the Parker committee six years earlier, and his emotional declaration of a new crusade may well have sprung from sudden relief at finding a respectable public justification for his acceptance of an SED line that cut right across the earlier justifications offered for the existence of his chair.

Donaldson must, however, have felt that Laurie's compromise with the college

system was dealing the St. Andrews plans yet another damaging blow and that in his evidence Laurie had as on earlier occasions betrayed a bitterness towards St. Andrews and Meiklejohn that might well have suggested he was not above behind-the-scene canvassing against the scheme. Donaldson, however, had made it clear that any new training centres that they might establish "would belong to the university and the university would be responsible for them - but they would be rather attached to them than actually in them".¹⁴¹ In other words they would not drag down the newly guaranteed high standards of the university's general work which was undoubtedly one of Craik's legitimate fears.¹⁴² Indeed they were to be no different from the new English university training centres that Laurie himself had helped to found, while Meiklejohn, with possible assistance, could still organise the new work of training for the Central Schools to which Laurie had attached so much importance. Moreover the Dundee School Board was to be a key partner in the new scheme so that the urgent needs of the school system would never be lost sight of. In truth, there was little difference between what Donaldson was proposing and what Laurie was supporting in Edinburgh, except that St. Andrews/Dundee had no colleges to take into any partnership. It is not surprising therefore that Kerr as inspector and, to some extent, guardian of the colleges, had no objection to the scheme, regularly using in his evidence phrases such as "quite suitable", "no difficulty at all" that were not regularly used by SED officials in such a context.¹⁴³

In the end in what was an undoubted political defeat for both Laurie and Craik, the Commissioners came to what Stocks has described as a very rapid decision¹⁴⁴ and recommended that students who had passed the new Preliminary Exam and intended to teach should be given financial support and should be allowed to enter the university directly instead of via some college, that no special courses or degree system should be devised for them and that in the case of St. Andrews, only the classes of the Professor of Education should be compulsory. (This was in line with the Commissioners' general policy of trying to avoid all new university expenditure

until the changes envisaged by the 1889 Act had been satisfactorily implemented.) Moreover they further advised that there should be no new university-sponsored training centre to administer a grant or provide t and g. However, at the same time, they advised, and this was a crucial decision, that a new Local Committee should be established to make arrangements for appropriate tuition even in 'special and practical subjects' i.e. t and g.

There was in this enough of a compromise to save the faces of Laurie and Craik for some at least of the St. Andrews/Dundee requests had not been met. But on the central issue of university independence Donaldson and Meiklejohn clearly had their way at last.¹⁴⁵ Nor was it only a St. Andrews victory. The commissioners' report went further. It also recommended that "the same arrangement should be open to the other universities" thus anticipating the SED's traditional stalling ploy that all the universities must be treated alike.

The eventual 1895 Circular clearly reflected the Commission's findings and in adopting their proposal to approve the establishment of local committees to organise university-based teacher-training, they foreshadowed in some ways the development, ten years later, of local Provincial Committees to oversee all forms of teacher-training in Scotland. The Circular did not for the moment make the adoption of the scheme mandatory on all four universities and while it was welcomed enthusiastically in the small universities, leading in Aberdeen, ironically, to even stronger links between colleges and university, in Glasgow and Edinburgh with their now well established older schemes, there was less enthusiasm.¹⁴⁶ Glasgow did eventually decide in 1901 to implement the scheme¹⁴⁷ but the Committee's work was soon overtaken by the changes of 1905-06. In Edinburgh, once Darroch had succeeded Laurie, it was eventually proposed, on the eve of the 1905 Minute to set up a Local Committee but this decision was overtaken by events and the decision was never fully implemented,¹⁴⁸ though the new university category of trainee teachers - King's Students - did actually appear in Edinburgh for a time.¹⁴⁹

In one sense therefore the 1895 Circular's claim that its provisions would extend widely the university's role in teacher-training was something of an exaggeration. Even in the small universities it left many questions unanswered. It did not specify what measures the Local Committees should take to ensure the provision of t and g and in Aberdeen they largely opted for provision by the college sector. The major effect of the Circular lay outside that sphere. In so far as it did not disturb the twenty year old arrangement whereby Edinburgh and Glasgow college students had been attending university it was in no way revolutionary, and in allowing universities to mount a full TT arrangement it was far from revolutionary either, in that only St. Andrews did so without College assistance. What *was* new was that it at last allowed universities to recruit students directly from among state-financed teacher-trainees with no college connections and to seek and buy services for them *from* the colleges in the way that the colleges, under the old scheme, purchased G from the universities for people who were essentially college students. The training initiative was thus moved from one sector to the other so far as these new Queen's Students were concerned. In effect they were G students seeking TT, rather than TT students seeking G. This gave yet another fillip to the gradual move towards an all graduate male profession. .

In 3 of the 4 centres, however, partnership with colleges remained the norm and the English pattern was really not followed outside the collegeless St. Andrews and Dundee. Indeed Craik's Circular had emphasised the partnership concept: "The universities will now have an opportunity of taking a share in the work along with the Training Colleges" and lest the universities should become over-confident, it warned that "the degree of success which attends their efforts in this direction will inevitably be measured by the comparative efficiency of the teachers whom they train as tested by the practical experience of school managers". In other words Craik was able to reconcile the change which had apparently been forced upon him by the Commissioners with the spirit of Payment by Results.

From this time also there was a new attitude to the training demanded of graduates in general. Hitherto those not attending college had been able to enter the state sector with a full certificate by merely supplementing their graduation with a short course in it at a college or by actually proving that they had had successful teaching experience. Laurie had found this unsatisfactory and had for long contended that they should be exposed to a much fuller programme of educational studies. Such exposure had now become more common with the acceptance of Education as a graduating subject in the Arts syllabus during the post-1889 reorganisation. The Commissioners' recommendation that Meiklejohn's lectures should be compulsory for those teacher-trainees given studentships at St. Andrews and the institution of the Schoolmaster's Diploma at Edinburgh encouraged such a process especially once the Diploma was recognised for full certification by SED in 1896.¹⁵⁰ Further diplomas were instituted at Glasgow and Aberdeen¹⁵¹ while in both universities the need to provide teaching for these and for students opting for Education in their Arts course led to the appointment of University Lecturers in Education, whose duties were similar to those of the Professors in St. Andrews and Edinburgh. However, because their salaries were so much lower, they usually combined this university post with college duties, thus cementing the links even further.

Such a new emphasis on making educational studies available to graduates or potential graduates in all four universities did, however, pose something of a threat to the economies of even the largest Colleges which inevitably lost students from many of their classes. Yet such classes had to continue in existence even if the growing tendency to graduate thinned out the numbers in many lecture rooms. They still had to provide a full range of courses for the minority of men who failed or did not attempt the new Preliminary examination as well as for a continuing majority of the women. The maintenance of at least part of the graduate training in the college was therefore financially essential and even greater relief would be brought, it was sometimes suggested, by making full-scale graduate training in the college sector

compulsory for all. The English had avoided such problems by placing the Day Training Colleges firmly in the university sector and by not encouraging university attendance from students in other colleges. However in Scotland the concept of partnership had now produced the financial problems which successive Blue Books had warned might occur, once university participation got out of hand. In the circumstances therefore it seemed unlikely that government could agree even to Laurie's continual aim of taking over all graduate training (albeit using the colleges for certain services) and there seemed always a danger that the arid demarcation disputes of the early 1870s might now be renewed.

In fact, however, Laurie's recent conciliatory gestures and Glasgow's eschewing of empire-building¹⁵³ helped to avoid this for the moment and the 1898 Blue Book noted how the new arrangements, far from putting the church sector on their guard in defence of vested interest, had actually stimulated colleges to send even more students to university under the the old arrangements, knowing that the higher intellectual tone this would produce would be good not merely for the educational system but for the social status of the college itself. It might even advance the time when the college might be incorporated into or associated with the older institution in the American style. HMI Ogilvie noted how some college lecturers, no longer begrudging the attendance of their elite at university, were now actively preparing them for the Preliminary and were acting as personal tutors on the Oxford model once they had arrived there.¹⁵³ In the following year the Inspector of colleges noted how the personal relationships of university and college staffs were getting closer every year¹⁵⁴ with the staff of both institutions increasingly performing teaching and supervision functions for each other - and not merely in the field of educational studies as such. A year later the report of a new inspector, Stewart, spoke of "an association, almost an affiliation of the Normal Colleges and the Universities", of a new atmosphere,¹⁵⁵ while the new local committees in St. Andrews, Dundee and Aberdeen were bringing together in a planning situation for the first time university,

church and school board figures as cooperators rather than as rivals.¹⁵⁶ And though Glasgow was slow, even too late in implementing a scheme that was soon to be superseded, the two or three years during which its Local Committee operated did see one result that could hardly have been anticipated from a reading of the Blue Books of earlier decades, for the University committee's success in tempting recruits to the university as Queen's Students apparently allowed the Glasgow colleges to admit further students from their waiting list,¹⁵⁷ a phenomenon hitherto never discussed and never mentioned in the official statements of an earlier period when any direct university recruitment was always portrayed by SED as a possible threat to college survival.

The more enlightened atmosphere prevailing by the end of the century both helped to cause and to reflect a more relaxed atmosphere in the educational system generally. The same period saw the ending of Payment by Results and in 1902, in the fashion of the times, the SED accorded to the college staffs considerably more autonomy in the arrangement of their own syllabuses and examinations. There is evidence that a Laurie now on good terms with Craik had a major role in such developments and certainly both Professors, by their writings and speeches, had undoubtedly helped to provide a wider knowledge of Educational Science in Scottish education generally, though it is doubtful if they and their Departments played as major a role in the formulation of their universities' policies as did the Professors and Education departments in the new English University Colleges,¹⁵⁸ but by the 1890s they had become sufficiently well-known and senior for their words to be noted if not heeded whenever SED policy was being made.

It is possible to criticise Laurie for his 'betrayal' of Donaldson before the commissioners though such a dramatic judgement on what were clearly tactics in a wider struggle for the development of secondary school training should not be allowed to obscure his remarkable achievement in persuading government to extend the original schemes for university attendance by college students on the scale that

they did. The authorities had in the beginning been by no means unanimous on the desirability of such a scheme. Even in the late 80s there were still Inspectors who felt that the cultural needs of the teaching profession could be exaggerated. The Glasgow inspector Bathgate, for example, in his report for 1887 claimed that "Some of the best teachers...have been persons of very slight general culture and some of the worst have been university graduates"¹⁵⁹ and cast doubt on the increasing importance being attached to university training.

The attraction of Laurie's compromises was that they gradually ranged government behind the idea of the graduate also being trained at a time when the secondary sector, and the private schools in particular, were extremely reluctant to commit themselves to any compulsory scheme. An increasing number of male students now seemed to feel that one of Laurie's class tickets might eventually prove of professional value quite apart from the ideas he purveyed. The inclusion of Education among the graduating classes confirmed this view and increased the standing of both the Professors among colleagues always suspicious of academic passengers. Until then both had had to rely on their own charisma and reputation for the attraction of non-college students and there was always the danger that the Cambridge experience of Quick would be repeated north of the Border. "Despite its talk of culture," said the St. Andrews student magazine, consoling Meiklejohn for his earlier small audiences, "a university is shamelessly utilitarian in respect to a degree"¹⁶⁰ and a class ticket that was neither a teaching certificate nor a degree component had little attraction still for the majority of students, even if they intended to teach.

However, even in the early days, the chairs did manage to perform other useful tasks of teacher education that had not been envisaged by their originators and in particular began to satisfy on quite a large scale the thirst for educational studies felt by one group as yet excluded from the universities, that is, women, who, in the 1881 census for the first time outnumbered men in the Scottish teaching profession. The census revealed that there were then 10,412 female teachers compared with 7,003

males. Ten years earlier the men had numbered 6,368 to the women's 6,059. In 1841, there had been twice as many men as women, and by 1911, there were to be more than twice as many women as men,¹⁶¹ reflecting the post-1872 expansion of schooling and the parsimony of the School Boards who found women cheaper to employ. Clearly, therefore, the rise of the female profession was to become a key issue in the history of teacher training and the Chairs.

In 1876 the admission of women to the Scottish universities was still some fifteen years distant though Laurie had already become a leading supporter, during the early 70s, of the Edinburgh Association for the University Education of Women¹⁶² and in 1876 following a general professorial arrangement made by some of his colleagues two years earlier,¹⁶³ he arranged to give the full course of what were presumably his undergraduate lectures to an extra-mural class of 25 women students, 15 of whom, he wrote, "worked most satisfactorily".¹⁶⁴ Among those attending this first session was Mary Russell Walker whom he especially commended for her "general native sagacity" and she in turn became tutor of a series of further classes held in St. George's Hall.¹⁶⁵

In November 1885, with the backing of the Association as well as that of Laurie and Professor Calderwood, the first chairman of the Edinburgh School Board, she explored the possibility of establishing a training centre for teachers of a grade above the normal schools. This she accomplished, arranging practice facilities at schools in Dean and Abbeyhill and certification with the Cambridge Syndicate, which now examined candidates throughout the United Kingdom, and used Laurie as one of its examiners.¹⁶⁶

It was a measure of the tolerance still accorded to Educational Studies in the university that the Principal became an active president of the venture. Each of the seven students in the initial intake completed the course successfully and immediately obtained a satisfactory post, thus increasing Laurie's hopes for the success of his secondary training campaign, for the presence of such a female group active among

the most socially exalted of Edinburgh schools, was, he felt, bound to display the fruits of proper scientific training.¹⁶⁷ Indeed he may well have regretted the irony by which, as an external examiner for the Cambridge Syndics in the days before SED recognition, he was able to examine and certificate these extra-mural female students at St. George's but not his male students within the university.

However, there was a reminder of the still pressing need for public and professional acceptance of the idea of education as a science when the staff of the practice schools expressed their misgivings about the application of the pupil teachers' theories and Miss Walker in the end found it necessary to set up her own secondary demonstration school.¹⁶⁸ As the experiment proceeded, Laurie began to give up lecturing himself and increasingly to recommend the services of his own former students to St. George's, thus foreshadowing the important patronage function of the Chairs and Lectureships in the following century. He did, however, maintain his oversight of courses and occasionally delivered a single lecture or short course on such subjects as Moral Education and Methods of Discipline.

Once women were finally admitted to the university it was taken for granted that as many as possible from St. George's would attend his course even though, it was said, "very few of them"¹⁶⁹ graduate and some were eventually entered for the Schoolmaster's Diploma. Autobiographies suggest that his understanding manner with young women not used to university methods of working ("Don't worry, my dear remember Herbert Spencer was a cantankerous old bachelor")¹⁷⁰ and his stimulating method of lecturing made his course more than usually popular with female students and complaints were published in the student newspaper that it was sometimes difficult for the men to hear over the serried ranks of women that filled the front rows of his classroom.¹⁷¹

It was among the St. George's staff that the first enthusiasm for American-style Child Study arose in Scotland. In 1893 Miss Clapperton, with English companions,

attended the American Child Study Conference in Chicago.¹⁷² Her report on this trip led to the Edinburgh Conference at which the British Child Study Society was established and Rex Knight has seen in these activities the first example of modern empirical educational research in the United Kingdom.¹⁷³

The St. George's organisation also produced correspondence courses and, in particular, courses for women who were attempting to obtain the popular St. Andrews qualification for non-matriculated students, the LLA,¹⁷⁴ the Ladies' Licentiate in Arts which, like Meiklejohn's chair, had been founded in 1876.

A Women's Association similar to the Edinburgh one had been founded in St. Andrews as early as 1868 but the idea of Edinburgh-style professorial courses had been abandoned in favour of the LLA scheme of distance education which not only catered for academically deprived women outwith the thinly populated north-east corner of Fife but also became a major source of finance and publicity for a university starved of both. Originally LA (Licentiate in Arts), its title had been altered to Lady Licentiate in Arts, to avoid confusion with the minor Glasgow degree of LA and the scheme continued until 1932, by which time over 11,000 candidates had presented themselves for examination.¹⁷⁵ Given the existence and under-use of the Chair, it was natural that Education should figure in its syllabus, especially as many of its patrons were governesses and other teachers of the middle and upper classes and the setting and marking of the LLA exam (which could be taken at numerous centres throughout Britain and the rest of the world)¹⁷⁶ provided Meiklejohn with a major and in some ways influential task, at a time when attendance at his male classes was derisory. Education's successful inclusion in the LLA also helped to persuade those who were still sceptical, of its fitness to be included in the MA proper, for all parts of the LLA syllabus had to be pursued at a "standard of attainment they endeavour to make the same as the MA" and could be taken not only at a pass but at an honours level. In a lecture in England, given to publicise the award, Knight, the professor of Moral Philosophy, emphasised his own recent realisation that there was "a whole literature

of Education in which those women who are practically engaged in educational work may help to solve some of our outstanding controversies."¹⁷⁷ and Cant, the main historian of the university includes both the LLA and the Education chair in the list of factors that revived St. Andrews and took its student numbers beyond 200 by 1883.¹⁷⁸ Even so, the LLA was never accepted as part of a teaching qualification by the SED to the great distress of both Knight and Meiklejohn.¹⁷⁹

That the existence of the chairs was in itself an important factor in facilitating such work among women is suggested by the fact that the equally enthusiastic women's movement in Glasgow which led to the foundation of Queen Margaret's College, never included Education among its initial courses, despite the preponderance of budding or actual teachers in the student body,¹⁸⁰ while at Aberdeen, though local examinations were provided for women, no other steps were taken by the University.¹⁸¹ The consequences of this seem to have made themselves felt for some time for when a 1906 series on career prospects in the student magazine reached the topic of women in teaching, it seemed to assume that any self-respecting Aberdeen woman graduate would expect to move to England not merely for a post but also for her training.¹⁸²

The extra-mural teaching of women provides a further reminder that both Laurie and Meiklejohn enjoyed a far wider audience for their ideas and a far wider scope for their influence than the size of their Arts class or their formal role in the teacher-training system would suggest. Moreover, Laurie's ability to attract non-matriculated students, teachers and public figures generally, to the Arts class itself, does much to explain his defence of the traditional Scottish open-door university, noted by Anderson, whereby any citizen, whether matriculated or not, should feel free to enter a university classroom¹⁸³ while his personal ability to attract large numbers may well explain his opposition to the Fee Fund.¹⁸⁴

Even so there can be no gainsaying the difficulty both had had in building up

voluntary classes before Education became a recognised subject for graduation. By 1878 Meiklejohn had attracted only 10 though he was currently conducting an informal extra-mural class in Dundee for some 87 people.¹⁸⁵ In 1886 he had to admit that his university class had "never been more than 22", though he believed he could "work it up to 50 or 60" if St. Andrews were given the full rights of a training centre (claiming in a typical Meiklejohn aside that too many students found the preparation for teaching tough going and opted for the church colleges instead - again not a sentiment to commend him to the authorities as a responsible trainer of youth.)¹⁸⁶ For some reason the investigation of his class numbers by both the University Commissioners and Parker were not repeated in the case of Laurie though in the 1890 Calendar, long after Education had become a graduating subject, Laurie announced the award of 22 first class certificates, suggesting that the class was a sizable one, and a year later this had risen to 33. In the days of the purely voluntary classes before Education counted towards Arts graduation, he claimed to have an attendance second only to that of the Professor of History at Oxford so far as non-graduating subjects were concerned and Foster Watson suggests that his class rose from twelve in his first year to 120 in his last.¹⁸⁷

The university calendars do of course provide considerable information about the content of the courses, and the St. Andrews calendar for 1877-78 gives the first full account of how Meiklejohn interpreted the threefold remit of the chair to cover the Theory, History and Practice of Education. The emphasis in the Theory section was clearly on Psychology though there are now difficulties in discerning the limits of this in the actual lectures, for the entry goes on to speak of such 'theory' as embracing not merely "the relation of the religious, moral and intellectual sides of human nature to each other" but also "the forms of school life and the relation of school life to the ordinary public life of this country" as well as "the theories and writings of the best thinkers upon education".

There is clearly a major overlap with the History section for that "examines and

weighs (not merely) the educational aims, beliefs, habits and processes of the national systems which exist in Germany, France, England and other countries" but also the "chief educational ideas of all periods of history from early China onwards" and the "best and most inspiring statements" of the great educational writers from Bacon to Herbert Spencer, including the fashionable Jacotot, Diesterweg and Fröbel.

"Practice" was very much concerned with Scottish schools and was highly ambitious - "an examination of all the processes at present going on in the schools of the country" - and no doubt contained a great deal of detailed advice from one of the leading producers of textbooks in the country.

Only for the LLA were specific text-books prescribed. For 1880-81 these were Carpenter's 'Mental Physiology', Spencer's 'Education' and Bain's 'Education as a Science' with the addition for Honours candidates of Arnold's 'Higher Schools and Universities in Germany', Schrader's 'Erziehung und Unterrichtslehre' and Braun's 'Pedagogie et Methodologie'; and as the last two do not appear to have been available in English, this was either a spectacular example of that common phenomenon, curricular window-dressing, or a firm proof that Victorian educational studies for young ladies were not the soft option they were often reputed to be.¹⁸⁹

Meiklejohn's course consisted of 100 lectures by the time it became an option for graduation, though the calendar entry remained vague and hardly ever changed. Given the smallness of the class, he may have preferred to make changes informally rather than go through the bureaucratic processes and proof reading normally involved in calendar alterations.

Laurie's early entries revealed him as less committed to a tripartite division of his task and indeed he seems to have been quite happy from time to time to alter or to tolerate alterations to the legal wording of the chair's title.¹⁹⁰ There is in his course naturally a great deal that is also found in that of his colleague - in particular, discussion of the Great Educators, Contemporary Systems and the place of the

Teacher in Contemporary Society – but, surprisingly, in a professional philosopher of the period, he seems far more concerned with physiological issues and the need to adopt a different pedagogy for each stage of human life and although his priority, he said, was to diffuse training with philosophy and history,¹⁹¹ there is also in the early days mention of grandiose schemes, hardly fulfilled in practice, for the provision of detailed instruction in schools and the provision of model lessons, and plans for a museum, an idea later pressed by Meiklejohn on the University Commission.¹⁹²

Once in office he began to make what were almost annual redrafts of his syllabus as presented in the calendar. The 1877 entry reflected his philosophical habits, itemising under the study of 'Method':

- Knowledge
- Methodology
- Goodness
- Obedience
- Exertion of Will

while under the heading of 'History' 26 different matters appear, ranging from education in China to 'the present state of education in the United States', something that was to have a crucial influence on the work of the Chair throughout the following century.

Laurie gave 4 lectures a week in the term before Christmas but only 2 (plus school visits) in the term after, considerably less than in St. Andrews, though there must be considerable doubt about the reality and reliability of calendar entries as an historical source. We know, for example, as was indicated earlier, that despite the strain of delivering 100 lectures in the two winter terms to which the Scottish academic year was still restricted, Meiklejohn could still find time in mid-February to visit London on personal business.

How far their work, and in particular their publications, influenced educational studies elsewhere is now difficult to evaluate. The early classes of the English and Welsh universities clearly made use of Laurie's 'Comenius' while his works on primary education and teacher-training were widely read and quoted by English writers. In 1896 the well-known American educationist, Will S. Monroe published a recommended list of professional readings for teachers, embracing a wide range of texts from both sides of the Atlantic, yet neither Scottish name appeared on it; although their work did appear in his more complete bibliography of education published a year later.¹⁹³ Indeed Laurie is given seven entries, far higher than most Americans, with two also for Meiklejohn. In America, Laurie's 'Comenius' and his 'Institutes' were so much admired that, according to Knox, he was actually offered the Philosophy chair at the new and highly prestigious Teachers College of Columbia,¹⁹⁴ an institution which from 1891 onwards aimed to collect within it the best educationists of the English speaking world and was eventually to offer extended hospitality to many of the leading figures, such as Boyd and Thomson, who were to dominate Scottish university studies in Education in the following century.

At the same time, despite the many posts that he held and the numerous public controversies that he engaged in (he was fond, for example, of asserting that the more efficient the SED became, the worse it was for the country¹⁹⁵) Laurie's reputation as a general philosopher, remained remarkably high despite the fact that as a Professor he insisted that he spoke as educationist.¹⁹⁶ After his retirement he was appointed Gifford Lecturer in Edinburgh and he continued to be spoken of with interest and admiration outwith Scotland. Passmore sees him as a relic of Reid's Common Sense philosophy in a Scotland that 'had not been wholly submerged beneath the wave of enthusiasm for exotic metaphysical systems. 'At the same time he sees him as a "highly idiosyncratic Scot...an Idealist in metaphysics and a Realist in epistemology." (a dichotomy that recalls some of the contradictions in his relationship with Craik).¹⁹⁷ Monin noted also how in his educational writings his well-known

emphasis on the physiological did not lead him to subordinate the spiritual: "(Son) idée dominante...est la distinction qu'il établit entre la vie animale de recipience et d'association et la vie humaine de percipience et de raison..."¹⁹⁸ Remacle also saw him as such a defender of human values and fundamentally as the opponent of Herbert Spencer,¹⁹⁹ though, with typical tolerance, Laurie always included Spencer in his course programme. For Davie, he was the central figure of "a sort of philosophical resistance movement ... the enigmatic personality, *Scotus Novanticus*, a man of the centre, incarnating the spirit of moderation and from him a network of Scottish influences would seem to have radiated in all directions..."²⁰⁰

In his general approach to Psychology, while he displayed the anecdotal pragmatism to be found in Quick and Meiklejohn, he had not necessarily fully attuned himself to the new scientific approach that he claimed to espouse at the expense of earlier philosophical approaches. Miss Walker, for example, was to question his judgement on the type of Psychology likely to satisfy the Cambridge examiners²⁰¹ and certainly his active period as a teacher predated the full Herbartian onslaught that destroyed faculty psychology in British educational thinking and was to act as a catalyst in the development of new scientific approaches to the study of education in the decade following his retirement, though his influence on his pupils Darroch and Drever did appear to make them more receptive to such ideas when they did eventually appear. Although he was to be present at some of the early meetings of the Child Study movement,²⁰² he appears to have taken no personal initiatives in such matters and to have been a purely ceremonial figure, a common role for the two Professors who were often required to dignify educational occasions with the prestige of their office without their necessarily having anything specific to contribute to the proceedings.

There can however be no doubt about Laurie's stature as a teacher and an educational influence. Selleck writing in the 1970s saw him as "perhaps the foremost educational theorist of the period and a man by no means given to a placid

acceptance of clichés.”²⁰³ Eighty years earlier, Quick had seen him as a “*ventilabrium*” opening up to late Victorian Britain authors such as Comenius who had largely been a closed book hitherto or, at least, only available in expensive, unsatisfactory German translations.²⁰⁴ He was frequently visited by educationists from America and the continent, particularly France, while the Swedish writer Ogren has attributed to him and to Meiklejohn much of the credit for the final dismantling of British payment by results and the establishment of a more relaxed, teacher-organised curriculum.²⁰⁵ Despite the Glasgow Free Church claims noted in the previous chapter, he himself claimed to have originated the idea of a Scottish concurrent training as well as the Licentiate in Arts as a possible teachers degree.²⁰⁶

Gunn is one of the few writers to question Laurie’s approach to Education implying that his professorial concern with History and Philosophy prevented him from developing a feel for the real issues of the classroom²⁰⁷ but this is probably mere stereotyping, for in his early days Laurie had had wide experience of classroom teaching not only in Scotland but in Ireland and on the continent.²⁰⁸ The fact that the *Educational Review* in 1894 twice reviewed his ‘Institutes’ (‘a treatise on education by a professor of education is not a book to be neglected’)²⁰⁹ and the fact that he had earlier refused an administrative post ‘qui’ according to Remacle, ‘eut réalisé la rêve de bien d’autres’²¹⁰ are just two pieces of evidence to suggest that not only did he value the Chair as a position from which to disseminate his views on teaching but that others respected the value of work that they did not see as purely theoretical and irrelevant.

At the same time although both professors did fulfil the role of national prophets and opinion-makers, their actual influence within the Scottish university system and their own institutions in particular must not be exaggerated. Patrick Geddes for example in Dundee, in Edinburgh (with the development of Ramsey Garden and the residential system) and in Montpellier (with the development of the College d’Ecosse) was far more influential and a greater revolutionary. Indeed both Laurie and

Meiklejohn were his reluctant disciples in ventures where his enthusiasm could carry them into unlooked for and embarrassing personal expense²¹¹ and Geddes was even to outshine Laurie in his enthusiasm for the Child Study movement²¹² while Donaldson was a far more effective defender of Educational Studies than Meiklejohn amid the politics of the 80s and 90s.

Even so, both Professors appear to have enjoyed some personal prestige in their own institutions. Pringle Pattison declared of Laurie that "a singular fearlessness of nature characterised him"²¹³ and his opposition to the Fee Fund, involving as it did public criticism of some of his more indolent or research-minded colleagues who wanted a regular, high salary without having to attract students personally brought him admiration as well as enemies. Meiklejohn also was never in awe of power as represented on Commissions and government committees and spoke his mind on many unfortunate occasions. In the small-scale but university-dominated social life of St. Andrews he played a major role as a public entertainer and as an active Liberal politician. *College Echoes*, the student newspaper, was frank enough to refer to him (given his non-graduating subject) as "something of an outsider"²¹⁴ but were quick to emphasise that they had gained much from his "sturdy personality of a type rarely met with nowadays". Laurie's role in the larger city was certainly a different one, dealing as it did (said the Senate's final letter of greeting) "with the great city corporations ... (and) with prominent citizens generally"²¹⁵ but he also was noted for his after-dinner speeches and his vast stock of couthy Scots anecdotes with which he peppered his lectures, to the scorn of the editor of *Student*²¹⁶ He gave one particularly successful talk to the Dumfries and Galloway society in which he skilfully used what was ostensibly a purely antiquarian portrait of Edinburgh University in the eighteenth century to demythologise its nineteenth century successor and the educational assumptions underlying its new system of roll-calls, written examinations and complex degree regulations that, he felt, had seriously disturbed what should be a freer and more fruitful intellectual intercourse between professor and student.²¹⁷

It is not surprising therefore that in the more formal setting of the Senate and Faculty of Arts where devotion to regulations and their alteration was a main preoccupation that his interest and influence should be less. Laurie, for example, appears to have only once attended Faculty meetings during his first two years in office and even then it was for a meeting at which his own salary was being discussed²¹⁸ while he did not attend the Senate until five years later when a dispute over a clash in lecture times actually involved his own class.²¹⁹ He thus helped to confirm the view that Education was a very marginal subject in the university curriculum.

It is also easy to exaggerate the importance of their actual work as Professors in their own daily lives. The Chair gave them a title, standing and a basic salary but much of their time was, of course spent on the other tasks that their search for funds and for influence demanded, often outwith Scotland far from the daily routine that dominated the lives of most Scottish educationists. It is not surprising therefore that in spite of the importance attached to the foundation of the Chairs by their sponsors and, indeed, by their opponents, they remained fundamentally marginal phenomena and both their foundation and their subsequent activities figure little in general educational histories of Britain or even of Scotland. Morgan, head of Moray House and a great admirer of Laurie and his ideas, wrote extensively on both his work and that of his successor Darroch but in a lengthy encyclopaedia entry on the history of Scottish Teacher Training, he does not mention the Chairs at all,²²⁰ while not only do most histories of English teacher-training ignore any influence the Chairs may have had as models or British pioneers²²¹ but even fail to notice the undoubted and publicly acknowledged role of Laurie in the development of Day Training Colleges²²² and the English disputes over Teacher Registration.

Even so, the long survival of these two professors in their tenured posts, though it may not seem a great achievement in itself, did nevertheless have considerable consequences for Educational Studies in the British universities.²²³ Had one or both of

them died or dropped out of the running at an early stage or indeed at any time before 1894 when the subject of Education was at last firmly fixed in the Arts curriculum, then it is likely that the experiment would have been abandoned if only under pressure from the Colleges and from an increasingly lively and formative SED. But by becoming veteran figures in their own institutions, they habituated the Scottish university and, indeed the British educational world to the notion of Professors of Education.²²⁴ By the time they retired, England and Wales were so full of such creations and the concept seemed so much less "foreign" that there now seemed no question but that successors should be appointed, despite the fact that virtually the same amount of work was being coped with successfully and more economically by mere Lecturers in Aberdeen and Glasgow. For such an outcome Laurie and Meiklejohn can personally take much of the credit.

NOTES

1. Iisalo (1979) p 34.
2. *Westminster Review* Jul 1876.
3. *Quarterly Review*.
4. *Monthly Journal of Education* Vol I, 1874, p 169. The letter (signed C.H.L. Kuros) is included now at length as embodying sentiments likely to be recognised by a contemporary audience. These sentiments are of the kind that eventually prompted Laurie, the first "Scotch professor", to tell the 1891 Committee on Teacher Registration that "there is no class of people in the world who are as incompetent to determine whether a teacher is fit to teach their children as the parents are" (Registration Evidence ch 1773, 17 Apr 1891).
5. *Education News* 15 Mar 1879.
6. *Education News* 19 Feb 1876. "London University will have a powerful sifting effect upon the Schoolmasters of Scotland" and it was seen as particularly relevant to the future staffing of secondary schools. There was a full discussion of this issue in *Fraser's Magazine* Aug 1876.
7. 1878 Univ Comm c 5918.
8. Grant (1884) Vol ii p 150.
9. Until 1890, the University had no over-all Principal and the Principals of St. Mary's and of the United Colleges were regarded as *pares* though whichever was the Senior Principal was in effect *primus* Cant (1970) p 125.
10. Laurie (1901) p 12, hardly giving credit to the entrepreneurship and enthusiasm for new chairs shown by the Edinburgh Senate itself.
11. Storr (1899) p 75. Gosden (1972) p 219.
12. Storr *op cit* pp 76 ff.
13. Barnard (1961) p 190.
14. This distance qualification was a relatively successful venture. Between 1880 and 1899 it issued certificates to 1,472 people, compared with the 1,563 certificated by the College of Preceptors in a period almost three times as long. Between 1890 and 1900 the University of London certificated only 77 of its own graduates in Education. *School World* Aug 1900.
15. Laurie (1901) p 5.
16. Gunn (1921) p 149.
17. Cruickshank (1970) p 113 quoting from the typescript of his

unpublished biographical notes on John Adams.

18. Welsh (1939) p 13.
19. *Educational Times* 1 Oct 1876.
20. Quoted in the *Schoolmaster* 7 Feb 1874.
21. *College Echoes* 24 Mar 1892 described a talk to the Liberal association as "often humourous and sometimes brilliant".
22. Reported in Gordon (1980) p 2. He saw one purpose of the chair as "studying ... the most favourable circumstances ... in which a child can grow up to be a citizen of the Kingdom of God".
23. Laurie (1901) p 5.
24. 1878 Univ Comm Report VI p 63.
25. *Ibid.* Evidence c 1746.
26. *Ibid.* Evidence c 2659.
27. *Ibid.* Evidence c 5336.
28. *Ibid.* Evidence c 6388. Black, it will be recalled, had been the main defender of the Bell chair proposal in the Church of Scotland General Assembly.
29. Laurie (1901) p 5.
30. He himself making a point about the public value of the chairs, estimated that such a sum represented one three-hundredth of a penny per cent per annum of the total educational expenditure of the country. Knox (1950) p 36.
31. Knight (1902) p 37.
32. His "delightfully fresh views" on the Fee Fund abolishing this arrangement were reported by the *Student* 15 Feb 1893.
33. Address by Meiklejohn to the Endowed School Commissioners 3 Apr 1883. SRO ED 13/197.
34. Thus he continued, throughout his period as Professor, his earlier commitments to the Church of Scotland and the Dick Bequest. In one sense, therefore, he saw the professorship as a part-time post.
35. SED Scheme 10 Feb 1888 under the Educational Endowments (Scotland) Act of 1882 (SRO). This scheme finally wound up the Bell Residue Fund, awarding what was left to Madras College. An interim (?) award had been gazetted in the *Edinburgh Gazette* Aug 1886. The augmentation was not without its parliamentary opponents and the sitting of the relevant Committee under the Educational Endowments Act was protracted. It also led to a public dispute between Meiklejohn and Principal Tulloch.

Educational News 18 Jul 1885.

36. Geddes papers NLS.
37. Balfour (1903) p 225.
38. A detailed advertisement of the series occupies a considerable space of the inside cover of the *Educational Review (London)* Nov 1894. Clearly the addition of the title "professor" was a selling point.
39. Skinner (1929) indicates that the Dick Inspectors were the first inspectors of schools in Scotland and that Laurie had set the pattern to be followed by Her Majesty's Inspectorate.
40. *Student* 16 Nov 1892. He remained in all these posts on becoming a professor and, indeed, after ceasing to be one.
41. *Monthly Journal of Education* 1875 p 444.
42. Laurie (1903) Prefatory Note. The same lectures were redelivered at the College of Preceptors.
43. For example, at the Commission of 1877-8.
44. C C Report 1884-85.
45. University College, Dundee (1883). In typical fashion, in proposing the toast of the city's educational institutions he noted that he had started his journey at half-past seven in the morning "which shows how far distant St. Andrews is from Dundee - we are sorry it is not nearer" and then drew attention to his involvement in the inspection of the Dundee schools.
46. Knox (1950) p 35.
47. 1878 Univ Comm Evidence 2257.
48. Article specifically on S.S. Laurie.
49. Gunn (1921) p 149.
50. Watson (1922) p 1068. He had produced the Bohn Library edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason*.
51. *Contemporary Review* Dec 1876 pp 102-3. "It is ... with a view to place professional training within the reach of the secondary and higher teachers of Scotland that the new professorial chairs have been mainly founded and it is in that direction that the defenders of the experiment look for its best justification".
52. Anderson (1983) pp 170-1. Its committee included Grant, Donaldson and Playfair.
53. With some diplomatic skill Meiklejohn was eventually to dedicate his eventual none too complimentary life of Bell to "The Trustees of Dr Bell's Will and the Founders of the two chairs in the

- Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews". Meiklejohn (1881).
54. Laurie (1901) p 3.
 55. Gordon (1980) p 1.
 56. Adamson (1930) p 411 notes his devotion to discovery learning as shown in an address at the 1889 Health Exhibition in South Kensington.
 57. Rich (1933) p 258.
 58. Laurie (1901) p15.
 59. *Ibid.* p 16.
 60. *Ibid.* p 18.
 61. *Ibid.* p 19.
 62. Laurie (1888) p 44.
 63. See, for example, Meiklejohn's attack on competitive examinations in *Monthly Journal of Education* 1874 p 20 ff.
 64. For example, Meiklejohn in Gordon (1980) p 13.
 65. Laurie (1901) p 37.
 66. Laurie (1899a) p 10, though the *Westminster Review* in the following July saw his Inaugural as marking a change from the time when the term *education* "had hardly any distinct meaning at all except perhaps as implying a mystic stimulus to Chartism and Socialism".
 67. Geddes papers NLS.
 68. Gunn (1921) p 152.
 69. Dent (1970) p 50 draws attention to the fact that many witnesses to the Cross Commission, examining the possibility of setting up Day Training Colleges in England "among them specialist HMIs, seemed to regard residence as the only means of safeguarding the morals of prospective teachers".
 70. "I may be wrong," he wrote, "but I do not believe that the university forms character" and he was against all such disciplinary procedures such as the calling of rolls, being well able apparently to cope with what Godfrey Thomson later found to be "unruly" Scottish students. Laurie (1888) pp 14 ff.
 71. Knight (1902) p 41.
 72. C C Report 1876-77 p xvi.
 73. Ramsay of Glasgow University recounted how Lowe had ironically asked one delegation "What do you want to teach in your parochial

schools? Would you like your children to learn Quadratic Equations or Latin or Greek?" to which the delegate had replied, "Certainly, if that is precisely what they have been in the habit of learning, and what we expect our schoolmasters to be trained to teach them". 1893 Univ Comm Evidence p 316.

74. Donaldson (1887) p 16.
75. In his letter of 12 Jan 1885 to SED he said, quite bluntly, "At present primary teachers are trained in our Normal Schools but the work done there could be better done in the university ..."
76. E.g. 1888 Committee on Teacher Training Evidence c 3488 where he describes their spirit as "too mechanical". C C Report 1888.
77. Laurie (1881) p 37. Such a view demonstrates the limits of his "control" of the colleges of which he was Secretary.
78. Laurie (1901) p 8.
79. 1878 Univ Comm Evidence c 4008.
80. Appendix to the Church of Scotland Education Committee's report to the General Assembly May 1875.
81. Ross (1883). He was eventually to become Glasgow University's first Lecturer in the subject.
82. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 303. This was Donaldson's view.
83. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 303.
84. C C Report 1900 p 543. This was the reaction of the new Inspector of training, Stewart. Two years earlier his fellow inspector, Kerr, had expressed the view that the role of the denominations was "at present more a nominal one than a real connexion". Evidence Committee on Teacher Training p 3.
85. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 311.
86. 1900 Univ Comm Report pp 297-9.
87. Craik: "My Lords must guard against any relaxation of the requirements as to an adequate and strict professional training" - letter from Craik to Aberdeen Court. C C papers 1884-85.
88. C C Report 1880.
89. C C Report 1876-7 p xviii.
90. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 311.
91. *Ibid.* c 316.
92. C C Report 1878 p 85.
93. *Ibid.* p 89.

94. C C Report 1876-7 p 212.
95. In the year 1878-79, 100 took advantage of the scheme, making a total of 373 since the scheme started in 1873 (C C Report 1878-9 Intro and p 297). In 1884 the University Education Class at Edinburgh was recognised as a Subject for College students attending University Classes under the Code for the first time and 27 attended (C C Report 1884 p xxiv).
96. C C Report 1880 p 210.
97. C C Report 1884 p xxiv.
98. Kerr in his Glasgow report of 1881, for example, welcomed the recommendation of the Endowed School Commissioners that this should be done. C C Report 1881 p 131.
99. Aber Sen 4 Apr 1884.
100. C C Report 1884 p 91.
101. C C Report 1884-5.
102. C C Report 1886 p xxiv.
103. Letter dated 12 Jan 1885, reproduced in C C Report 1884-5.
104. The G C forwarded a supporting letter on 15 Jan.
105. 31 Jan 1885, reported in C C Report 1884-5.
106. Which had been suggested as the practice school by Laurie in his 1877 plan.
107. C C Report 1886 p xxiv.
108. *Ibid.*
109. *Ibid.* p 296.
110. C C Report 1887. Report on Colleges.
111. Horn (1967) p 187.
112. This was established, at Laurie's own suggestion in 1880, for students who completed four of the "recognised" degree courses together with a fifth which might not be "recognised" as part of the MA structure. This might, of course, be Education, and thus the LA could increase the size of that class in Edinburgh. Cruickshank (1970) p 97.
113. Laurie's Introductory Lecture for the 1886-7 Session reported in *Education News* 6 Nov 1886. In fact, it attracted what Laurie called "a very fine class of students, superior to the ordinary Queen's Scholar" to the Training Centre but by 1893 was still attracting fewer than ten students per year. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 313.

114. In C C Report 1888 following p 603.
115. See this chapter below.
116. C C Report 1888 Parker Committee Report.
117. *Ibid.* p 17.
118. C C Report 1888 Parker Evidence c 866.
119. *Ibid.* c 867.
120. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 303.
121. He asked, in his evidence, for "special note" to be taken of two recent Diplomates in particular. One was an MA who had not only passed the required exams but had also satisfied both Laurie and Paterson, the Rector of the Free Church Centre, of his competence as a teacher and had also taught for a year before he came up. Another had a special competence in Maths teaching. He felt that the production of such people needed helpful "pressure" from SED.
122. At the same time it would be wrong to see Laurie as a permanent ally of Craik, as his continuous attacks on SED make clear that he always opposed government domination of education. In Laurie (1892) p 17 he expresses his annoyance that while civil servants like Kekewick and Craik can broadcast their own educational "philosophy", secondary teachers are still denied such a thing and he often spoke of the need for a healthily inefficient SED, hardly Craik's own ideal.
123. Laurie (1901) p 83. "We prefer university institutions for the training of every grade of teacher to specialised training colleges, simply because they are not specialised".
124. C C Report 1888 Parker Evidence c 2693.
125. Professor Christie, an Aberdeen witness and a member of the Established Church Education Committee, again put forward an increasingly popular suggestion that the hitherto concurrent G and TT elements should be detached so that presumably if they chose, students could seek their government-subsidised G in Aberdeen even though they wished to take their TT in Edinburgh or Glasgow.
126. C C Report 1888 Parker Evidence c 3488.
127. *Ibid.* c 3495.
128. *Ibid.* c 3499.
129. *College Echoes* 9 Jan 1890. The proposal is described as coming "from C S Parker MP".
130. In 1900 Univ Comm Evidence 318, Ramsay (19 Jan 1893) expressed the "view very strongly ... that the University ought to do University work and that the Training College ought to do Training College work and that we of the University could not do Training

College work well".

131. C C Report 1888 Parker Evidence p 12.
132. Cant (1970) p 123.
133. *Educational News* 11 Jan 1890. It reminded Donaldson that students' grants were only temporarily necessary until the profession became "respectable" and to pay such grants to the universities would raise "a whole new principle".
134. *Journal of Education (Scottish Edition)* Jan 1895 p 42.
135. "I had a good deal to do with originating the idea of Day Training Colleges - (I was) as we say in Scotland, 'at the biggin o' t'". Laurie (1901) p 79.
136. Rich (1933) p 221. Dent (1970) p 49 also makes it clear that the Cross Commission was intended "to investigate the possibility of establishing in England and Wales non-residential day training colleges, such as there were in Scotland". In Bibby's view, English officials were not so much impressed by the educational desirability of Scottish Day Training as by the savings that could be made through not having to build new residential colleges. Bibby (1961) p 246.
137. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence.
138. His evidence begins on p 290 of 1900 Univ Comm Evidence.
139. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence c 314. Laurie played a strongly nationalist hand: "we have Scotch circumstances and Scotch traditions to consider and Scotch universities to work with..."
140. *Ibid.* He appeared determined to distance himself from Meiklejohn on every possible occasion.
141. *Ibid.* c 306.
142. Stocks (1986).
143. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence p 322, though he does also offer advice on a possible "sandwich course" arrangement as an alternative to a post-graduate training scheme mentioned in the proposals.
144. Stocks (1986) noting, on the basis of the Minute Book (SRO ED 9/2) that "without ever being discussed in committee, the matter was settled at a single meeting of the full Commission - on a day when there was much other business as well".
145. Stocks (1986) suggests that their success was, at least in part, due to the arrival in office of Rosebery, Donaldson's patron, who was no doubt keen to bring to an end what was, in effect, a purely denominational system of teacher training. At least it provided evidence that Craik was not omnipotent and had occasionally to bow to his political masters.

146. *Educational News* 28 Mar 1903 held Laurie responsible for the failure of the two large universities to develop Local Committees, which he presumably saw as superfluous in view of the development of the secondary-orientated Schoolmaster's Diploma and of better relations with the Colleges.
147. Glas Sen and Court 1902-3 *passim*.
148. The first sign of the proposal in the Senate minutes is on 15 Oct 1904 three months before the SED Minute of 1905 that initiated the changes.
149. The C C Report for 1908 reports that 103 were admitted that year.
150. Though its acceptance was coupled with an official belief that "it is improbable that for some time at least, the ranks of the teaching profession will be very largely recruited from this source". C C Report 1897 p 438.
151. Though these were never as successful as Laurie's project.
152. There was a feeling among some Glasgow professors that the whole 1895 scheme "would bring discredit" on the universities. Cruickshank (1970) p 120 quoting a privately printed paper by Professor Dickson (Glas Univ archives).
153. C C Report 1898 Teacher Training Report. This impression of College staff acting as tutors to students concurrently in university was confirmed by Adams in his address to the Second Conference of the Universities of the Empire. Report p 268.
154. C C Report 1899 Teacher Training Report.
155. C C Report 1900 Teacher Training Report.
156. The setting up of a separate Dundee committee did not take place until 1900 after some of the worst financial disputes between Dundee and St. Andrews had been ironed out. The mere fact of there being a separate committee for St. Andrews was in itself a manifestation of continuing problems that had little to do with Education as such. The *Journal of Education (Scotland)* 1895 p 181 reflects a common worry that Dundee's academic life was not sufficiently developed to support such a Centre, a view said to have been shared by Craik. Cruickshank (1970) p 117.
157. The Scottish correspondent of the *School World* (Nov 1904) actually attributes the setting up of the Glasgow Committee to congestion in the Colleges. Though this is one of the reasons adduced in the Faculty of Arts report recommending its establishment (Glas Den 6 Mar 1902) the main reasons given are "the better equipment of the university" and "the widespread desire expressed by the public in general and by teachers in particular that the University should exercise a more direct control of the training of teachers".
158. Armytage (1955a) p 10 believes that their Education Departments saved the English University Colleges from becoming mere

technical colleges.

159. C C Report 1887 p 211. "What we want is not less normal training," he said, "but more of it, and no amount of general culture can make up for the want of this discipline".

160. *College Echoes* 16 Mar 1893.

161. Anderson (1983) p 79. In this respect Scotland had earlier differed considerably from England where, in the 1861 Census 72.5% of those recorded as teachers had been women. Reader (1966) p 172.

162. This succeeded an earlier organisation of which Laurie had been a co-founder in 1867, the Edinburgh Ladies Educational Association. Foster Watson in D N B (1901-11).

163. Davies (1896) p 28.

164. Welsh (1939) p 5.

165. *Ibid.* p 13.

166. *Ibid.* p 21.

167. Though it is possible to exaggerate the significance of such activities. Even in 1904-5, for example, only 4 took the Schoolmaster's Diploma and 9 the Cambridge Certificate.

168. Welsh (1939) p 21.

169. Balfour (1903) p 226.

170. *Ibid.* p 53.

171. *Student* 18 Nov 1897.

172. Bramwell and Hughes (1894) p iii describe the work of the Gilchrist Trust, typical of a number of organisations currently arranging teacher visits to America.

173. Knight (1951) p 84.

174. An advertisement to this effect appears, for example, in *College Echoes* Mar 10 1915.

175. Knight (1951) p 123 n.

176. In 1900, for example, it was taken by 980 candidates at 84 centres throughout the world. *School World* Sep 1900.

177. Knight (1887) p 17.

178. Cant (1970) pp 122-3.

179. *School World* 1903 p 72.

180. Murray (1914).

181. Davies (1896) p 28.
182. *Alma Mater* 14 Feb 1906.
183. Laurie (1901) p 194 "every professor and every subject should be accessible to the general public without reference to graduation".
184. *Student* 15 Feb 1893. The Fee Fund was meant to remove the wide differences in professional income deriving from their popularity as attractors of students.
185. 1878 Univ Comm Evid c 11200.
186. Parker Committee Evidence c 3483.
187. D N B (1901-11).
188. This list forms an interesting comment on the untenable claim by Kandel (1933) p 5 that only the works of the Paynes and Quick were used in the early British departments of Education.
189. In fact, Rusk in a BQ interview not only poured scorn on the LLA set books but said he regarded the whole structure of the examination as "a swindle".
190. In the very subtitle of his edited version of his Inaugural Address, for example, (Laurie (1901) p 1) he inaccurately refers to it as the Bell Chair of the Theory, History and *Art* of Education.
191. Laurie (1892b) p 59. Without them, he said, it was "a kind of superstition producing a new type of pedant..."
192. 1878 Univ Comm Evidence c 11196.
193. The existence of such independent bibliographies reflects the finding of Fitch (1890) p 111 that "all through the States there is a much greater demand for educational literature than in England and even the more philosophical treatises on education ... are eagerly and largely read".
194. Darroch in Monroe (1911) p 653.
195. For example in Laurie (1903) Prefatory note.
196. Laurie (1899b) p 15. "Philosophy is not the subject of this Chair and you must therefore be often content to rest satisfied with statements which cannot be presented to you in their full reasoned form, but rather wear a dogmatic aspect."
197. Passmore (1957) p 281.
198. *La Grande Encyclopédie* (Edn 1887-1902). Entry on S S Laurie.
199. Remacle (1909) p xi.
200. Davie (1961) p 333, who also emphasises the importance of Laurie's French connections, linking them to those of Patrick

Geddes.

201. Welsh (1939) p 24.
202. E.g. at an 1899 meeting of the Edinburgh branch. "Above all," said its report, "we had Professor Laurie, ... to whom we in Scotland naturally look for encouragement in our work and aims as a Society". *Paidologist* Vol I p 133.
203. Selleck (1968) p 25.
204. Quick (1890) p 135.
205. Ögren (1953) p 151.
206. Laurie (1881) p 37.
207. Gunn (1921) p 149.
208. Rémacle (1909) *Notice Biographique*
209. *Educational Review* (London) Dec 1894 p 59. Despite the slight irony, the reviewer, Stock, takes the book seriously.
210. Rémacle (1909) p xi.
211. Geddes papers N L S.
212. *Paidologist passim*.
213. *Student* 17 Mar 1909.
214. *College Echoes* 16 Mar 1893.
215. Edin Sen 5 Jun 1903. In his reply Laurie claimed that their "kind note" took him "quite by surprise" as he "under the impression that no academic man received a word of laudation from his fellow-men until he was where eyes see not and ears hear not ..." Edin Sen 3 Jul 1903.
216. *Student* 18-26 Nov 1897. This was to be a characteristic of many university teachers of the subject in Scotland. Even the Senate's farewell memorial to Laurie mentioned his "often racy contributions to debate". Edin Sen 5 Jun 1903. See chapter 6 below.
217. *Student* 16 Nov 1892.
218. Edin Sen 27 Jan 1877.
219. Edin Sen 18 Jan 1882.
220. Laurie (1912) p 205.
221. Thomas, at least, acknowledges the lead given by Scotland. Thomas (1983) p 130.
222. Laurie (1901) p 79. He was also, according to Thomas, instrumental

in getting the Glasgow Lecturer Adams appointed head of the London Day-Training College. *British Journal of Teacher Education* Vol 4 no 3 p 249.

223. Adamson (1930) p 493 notes for example, how, in 1896, Oxford adopted the terms of the Edinburgh Professor's Title (Theory, History and Practice of Education) as the Title for their own Education Course.
224. Perhaps the most remarkable example of how habituated university authorities had become to the notion of Chairs of Education comes from Trinity College, Dublin, where a private individual, E P Culverwell requested permission to deliver a course of lectures in the College, followed this with a plan for a Secondary training department and was made its Professor, all within two years (1903-5). Bailey (1947) p 86 - though it has to be noted that immediately he left there were moves to abolish the Chair and to appoint a Lecturer instead. McDowell and Webb (1982) p 417.

CHAPTER 4 THE PROVINCIAL COMMITTEES

The success of the local committees in St. Andrews and Aberdeen and a new, positive attitude of goodwill on the part of college staff towards the development of educational studies within the universities meant that the new century began promisingly not merely for the two holders of Chairs but also for the Lecturers now appointed to the other three centres of university study, Glasgow, Dundee and Aberdeen.

Any developments in Glasgow, then the largest of the Scottish universities and the one most influential in the most populous part of the country, were crucial. Opposition to the chair in the West of Scotland had been particularly virulent during the early 70s, indeed crucial in the conversion of government according to Shairp, and although Ross of the Glasgow Free Church College had been a leading advocate of education as a university subject throughout the decade that followed, it was generally believed that both ecclesiastical and university opinion was at worst opposed or at best apathetic. Certainly there had been no enthusiasm in 1896 for the establishment of a Local Committee but when one was finally established seven years later, absence of any reference to earlier problems in the Senate minutes suggests an earlier lack of interest rather than any major opposition.¹ In fact the decision appears to have been taken in virtually complete ignorance not merely of the successful experiments in St. Andrews and Aberdeen but also of the legal formalities required to establish such a body. A Local Committee seemed an entirely fresh concept to both the professors and their advisers and when Jones suggested it,² they mistakenly assumed that its duties could be undertaken by the Court itself,³ an arrangement totally out of keeping with the Code, which demanded wide local representation and the proposal was soon vetoed by SED.⁴

These events suggest that it is possible to exaggerate the degree of actual

opposition to Educational Studies within Glasgow University itself during the previous thirty years. Certainly the Senate had been willing to take part in the 1875 discussions on an all-university plan for teacher-training⁵ though their support wavered once it was realised that the provision of TT as well as G was actually envisaged by their colleagues.⁶ Their assumption was always that all practical training would be undertaken by the local colleges and only after reassurances on that score did they eventually join in the 1877 submission.⁷ The Glasgow aim was to attract more Arts students rather than actually to train teachers and it shied away from the idea of substituting a university curriculum for the Normal School course.⁸ Thus when a Glasgow teachers' diploma was actually launched, it did not aim like Laurie's Schoolmaster's Diploma to provide both academic and practical training within the university itself, but merely to certify that the candidate had attended certain courses in the Arts curriculum and had satisfied a local college in terms of t and g.⁹

Despite evidence of considerable pressure from the EIS and elsewhere, following the events of 1874-6 formal consideration of a possible Glasgow chair was delayed until February 1883 when the Senate debated a sub-committee's report on the possible use of part of the Bell endowments to be dealt with by the Scottish Commission then in session.¹⁰ This involved a sum of between £9,000 and £10,000 which had been left by Dr Bell himself for use specifically in Glasgow in the founding and maintenance of schools operated on the Madras system. The proceeds of the fund had been used in the Sessional school system of Glasgow but, following 1872, such a use was quickly coming to an end. The Senate sub-committee had considered the possibility, advocated by the EIS, that the Commissioners should allocate this fund to found a Chair or Lectureship in Glasgow similar to that established from the Bell Funds in Edinburgh and St. Andrews; and the syllabuses of the new professors were subjected to close scrutiny by the sub-committee. A great deal of these seemed to consist of "Logic and Psychology" - already well covered, they suggested, by existing Glasgow courses but "in view of the closer relations that have lately been formed

between the Training Colleges and (this) University", some arrangement might be made for a Lectureship to provide "special instruction in the History of Educational Methods and in the Art of Teaching". They suggested not a chair but a 5 to 7 year Lectureship in educational systems, even involving the provision of t "through the schools attached to the Training Colleges". The Lecturer's work might also be linked to the new Licentiate in Arts, the short course seen by Laurie and others as a possible G qualification for the lower ranks of the teaching profession.

None of the money *was* claimed, however, and a letter from Aberdeen EIS, on the subject of a Chair which reached the Court nine months later was merely laid on the table:¹¹ and the entire Bell Glasgow fund was, according to Smith, transferred to the City Education Endowments Board to be divided up into bursaries and other small sums.¹²

There had obviously been an awareness of the financial problems which St. Andrews and Edinburgh were still facing over their chairs and continuing financial difficulties in Glasgow itself provide as plausible an explanation for inactivity as any purely academic prejudice, given that three years later, *all* the proposals made by the General Council for new chairs, including one in Education, were immediately referred back for elaboration "with regard to financial arrangements".¹³

New pressures for a chair arose, of course, because of the increasing presence of G-seeking teacher trainees in the student body and when in 1890 Sir John Cuthbertson pressed the Court to make Education an optional subject in the Arts degree he was told that while that would be an desirable development, as there was no-one in post to teach it, it was clearly impossible.¹⁴

In view of the fact that opposition in the West was usually attributed to the Churches and their colleges, it is interesting to discover the first real progress being made in 1893 as a result of a petition on university Educational studies from the two Presbyterian colleges and the EIS acting in unison. This demanded a

Chair/Lectureship in Education on the grounds that the subject now qualified for graduation in Edinburgh and St Andrews.¹⁵ and it was felt that such an option should be available to College students seeking university G. Remarkably, further discussion was confined to the Court rather than the Senate and two months later they agreed to the proposition.¹⁶ The only proviso they made was that the work of this new "Chair" (*sic*) must not overlap with that of Logic or Moral Philosophy and without asking the prior opinion of Senate and Faculty on the general proposition, merely asked them to draw up the regulations under which the "Chair's" holder would operate.¹⁷

In fact, of course, in view of the university's financial position, the "Chair" became a Lectureship and Ross, already head of the Church of Scotland college, was appointed for five years as part-time Lecturer. Thus Education took its place for the first time in the Glasgow Arts syllabus, hardly a surprise development in view of the firm place it had now established in Edinburgh.

Actual enthusiasm seems, however, to have been confined to the Court and General Council and to have been singularly lacking in the Senate. In March 1895 the Faculty of Arts openly expressed its doubts about whether the 100 lectures in Education *could* be ranked as the academic equivalent of a full course in other Arts subjects and a committee was appointed by the Senate to investigate the matter.¹⁸ Far from approving its inclusion, all that it could say in defence of Education was that as the Lecturer had been legally appointed "it was inexpedient ... to disturb the arrangement".¹⁹ In 1898 there was again a call "to consider the position of Education as a subject for graduation"²⁰ but propriety demanded that no further action was taken during Ross's terminal illness.²¹ Even so, the Education class remained the object of sniping – for example, in January 1899, when Professor Ramsay complained that men and women were being allowed to attend Education classes together without the sanction of Court or Senate.²²

A diploma combining G and TP in the university with t and g in the colleges could now be instituted and, not surprisingly, eventually accepted as a teaching qualification by an SED that was already willing to accept Laurie's far more ambitious Schoolmaster's Diploma. The arrival of John Adams (later to be the founding father of the London institute) as Lecturer had an immediate impact and in November 1901 the process began that was eventually to lead to the establishment of the Glasgow Local Committee.²³ Under Adams an actual department of Education with assistants was proposed for the first time. A Senate report of March 1902 made it clear that such moves were concerned "with the better equipment of the University" and resulted from a "very widespread desire expressed by the public in general and by teachers in particular that the University should exercise a more direct control of the training of teachers". It was felt that the University should be able to offer facilities for the students to enter any of the recognised professions, but that there was no provision made by the University for the professional training of any student who desired to become a teacher. A means of meeting this want was therefore "to be found in the establishment of what is called a 'Local Committee' under the SED".²⁴

This introduction of an apparently strange new animal to Senate members does not wholly ring true. In June 1896 the General Council had already asked to be given membership of any such Committee were one to be established in Glasgow and they had outlined the current Aberdeen position in some detail though the matter was subsequently brushed aside.²⁵ This new-found enthusiasm cannot therefore be easily explained at this distance, though Adams' charisma and his links with a wider academic world must have played a part. Perhaps even more important was the current pressure of numbers on the local colleges who simply did not have the capacity to admit all suitable candidates from the West at a time when the Annual Report of the Western HMI was drawing attention to "a distinct dearth of certificated teachers".²⁶ The colleges could therefore without economic loss offer the university an academically attractive overflow likely to offer the Court a highly satisfactory extra

income from government sources. Certainly any academic doubts about Education as a university subject seem to disappear from both Court and Senate minutes from this time onwards and any disputes are merely confined to defining the Local Committee's membership²⁷ and continuing to press the case of Logic and Moral Philosophy as prerequisites for those studying Education,²⁸ presumably to protect the interests of those chairs in an Arts Faculty increasingly filled with recruits to the teaching profession.

To the outside world the development was presented (by Adams himself?) as a natural development of a university enthusiasm hitherto thwarted by outside events. "(The earlier diploma)" said an official response to a request for information from the *School World* "worked well as far as it went but all the time it was recognised that it was no more than a makeshift and that the usefulness of the university ought to be extended so far as to give systematic and direct practice in the art of teaching".²⁹ In fact this is hard to sustain in the light of the official Glasgow evidence given to the University Commissioners six years earlier by a Senate, which directly repudiated Laurie's enthusiasm for providing t as well as TP. Nearer the mark was the admission that such a move "became all the more necessary as the Training Colleges ... gradually became congested".

Certainly the new Glasgow scheme was an ambitious one, with places open to both graduands and non-graduands, a somewhat strange development in the increasingly selective Scottish university world of the early 1900s though, in that respect, similar to developments in the Day Training Departments of the English universities. The choice of the providers of t and g was entirely in the hands of the Committee but given the large representation of the Colleges it was unlikely that they would be bypassed and unlikely that SED approval would be forthcoming, were they to be so. On the other hand various schools outside the Colleges were selected for teaching practice in the Edinburgh manner.

Even so, the success in launching a Local Committee did not necessarily reflect any widespread new enthusiasm for Education as a subject. Crichton, a graduate of 1904, who later wrote enthusiastically of Adams' teaching, still recalled that Education was "rather looked down on compared with Logic, Moral Philosophy and English Literature".³⁰

Adams was to leave for London before the Local Committee's operations actually began and its career was to be brought to an abrupt end by the upheaval in Teacher Training produced by the SED "nationalisation" Minute of January 1905. The actual establishment of such a Committee did, however, mark a turning point in Glasgow's attitudes to Educational Studies. There was still not the enthusiasm (or the finance?) needed for the establishment of a Chair but there was now a basis of acceptance upon which Clark (Adams' immediate successor) and, eventually, Boyd could build during the next forty years. Initially it was intended to admit 120 students; on this basis the scheme was expected to break even during the second year and to aim especially at recruitment to advanced and Higher grade departments of schools,³¹ though during the second year of operation only 62 were admitted.³²

In Aberdeen, on the other hand, there had always been widespread, if not unanimous, enthusiasm for the introduction of Education. As we have seen, evidence to the University Commissioners given in the 1878 Report makes it clear there was never unanimity among the professors on the subject but the Aberdeen Court, Senate and General Council had probably always had a majority in favour not merely of Educational Studies within the university but also of a Chair. In fact, a significant aspect of the university's popular image elsewhere in the British Isles was as a producer of teachers and its reputation as a teachers' university was not one that it chose to hide. At the 1914 Congress of the EIS Principal Adam Smith was to boast that out of some 5,000 living graduates, some 1,080 were known to be teachers, either in Britain or the colonies, while a later speaker suggested that the ratio was even more striking and that one in every 3.5 members of the General Council was in some

way engaged in educational work, medicine alone having a greater significance among Aberdeen graduates.³³ So dominant were budding teachers in King's College, that the student newspaper actually regretted that there was not a greater spread over all the available professions.³⁴

Throughout the years between the Bell chairs' establishment and Nisbet's taking office as first Aberdeen professor in 1962 there were continual formal attempts made to have a Chair established³⁵ and continual rumours that funding had become available. Indeed, funds did exist at one time, even possibly part of Bell's bequest³⁶ and certainly there was to be later funding of such a venture by Carnegie, but never on sufficient a scale at the required moment. Even the establishment of a part-time Lectureship on the Glasgow model, however, was not without its difficulties and it would have been strange if at least a minority of the Aberdeen Senate had not had some qualms about admitting such a subject to its curriculum. According to Sir Herbert Grierson who held his first chair there, the subject of Pedagogics "was regarded with considerable suspicion by the older fashioned among us and was rather unwillingly admitted into the curriculum" although, he later conceded that there was no use in belittling "a subject to which Plato devoted so full, so arresting, so vital a dialogue as the *Republic*".³⁷

In fact, lectures on Education within the university were first announced in the calendar of 1890 but it was to be four years before any established Lectureship was formally created and there is some doubt about whether any official university lectures *were* actually delivered during that time. In 1893 Ogilvie, head of the Church of Scotland college and already a man of sixty was formally appointed part-time lecturer³⁸ - an appointment seen by some more as a crowning honour³⁹ than as answering the challenge of a new post and the establishing of a controversial new subject as an option in the revised Arts curriculum. Even so he produced a syllabus that was as elaborate as it was ambitious covering much of the ground of Laurie's own course which he clearly used as a model. Despite his major commitments

elsewhere, Ogilvie's appointment certainly did the status of educational studies no harm, his own academic status in the eyes of the Senate being so high that he had for a time acted as a temporary Professor of Humanity.⁴⁰ However in 1898, Ogilvie was replaced by Clarke, a well-known Aberdeen teacher and a much younger man, for whom the university post was a major commitment even though, like many other Aberdeen University staff, he was also to find much of his work in the College sector and clearly that sector's work had expanded following the establishment of the Local Committee which used its services extensively. Unlike the Glasgow Committee, Dey, the Chairman, and his Aberdeen colleagues assumed that all of their recruits would graduate and actually demanded higher university entrance requirements of Queen's Students than were required of other undergraduates at that time⁴¹ because of the "greater demands" of a concurrent course of training. As a later writer put it, Dey "recast the whole Normal School curriculum, developed the idea of the King's Scholarship (and adjusted) the curriculum of Education to its proper climax in a university degree". A diploma similar to that in Glasgow was eventually also available and because of the existence of such a vigorous Local Committee, it was possible from the start for it to include forms of training undertaken *inside* the university under the 1896 Scheme, as well as in the training centres outside it.

Alongside all this and despite increased optimism, for the two universities with chairs, the century was to open on a more uncertain note. The two pioneers who had kept the chairs in existence and increased their influence during the first twenty five years were coming to the end of their careers. They had still failed to persuade Glasgow and Aberdeen to appoint actual Professors and while their personal reputations might be high and their own classes enthusiastic, the existence of their Chairs could still, as we have seen, seem an irrelevance to writers on Scottish education in general and even writers on Scottish teacher training in particular. Kerr, who had shown them much good will, merely mentions their foundation in passing and without comment in his influential 1910 survey of Scottish education for the

Cambridge University Press.⁴² Judd, in his survey of teacher training in England, Scotland and Germany for the United States Bureau of Education, makes no mention of them at all,⁴³ nor do the Canadians Hughes and Klemm in their major Scottish survey of 1904.

Insofar, therefore, as what success the Chairs had achieved depended on the strong and colourful personalities of Laurie and Meiklejohn, the nature of their successors might well prove crucial for the continued success or even the survival of the whole venture.

The situation at St. Andrews was particularly complex. The two St. Andrews colleges had, in the course of the 1890s, after protracted litigation, been united with University College, Dundee. However, the union proved far more financially and administratively troublesome than its advocates had imagined and University College remained far more separate organisationally than had at first seemed likely. St. Andrews had always sought to develop Educational Studies there and, indeed, it was their wish to forward such developments in Dundee that had prompted the 1896 scheme. Even so it proved impossible to run a University centre there immediately despite the fact that one of the University Principals was the keen chairman of the centre in St. Andrews itself. A separate Dundee Committee and Centre were not eventually established until 1900 and a schoolmaster, Malloch, rather than the Professor was placed in charge, providing practice in his own school for a handful of students drawn from an Arts Faculty of a mere thirty-seven men and women.⁴⁴

The new Professor, Edgar, far from being a Meiklejohn, was, though apparently a good teacher,⁴⁵ one of the less colourful figures on the Scottish educational scene and seems to have struggled unsuccessfully throughout his twenty years in office not only with the perennial financial problems of his office and with the equally thorny question of Dundee but also with chronic ill health.⁴⁶ As a Snell exhibitioner and a distinguished graduate of Glasgow and Balliol, he was academically acceptable to the

Senate but, like many of his colleagues unable to develop a proper sphere of operations on either side of the Tay. Moreover, in both places, the Local Committees had to operate in a quite different situation from their colleagues elsewhere for in neither St. Andrews nor Dundee was there a College or Normal School of any kind on which they could draw for help with t and g. St. Andrews itself, as always, still lacked the major stock of practice schools needed to satisfy SED while Dundee lacked both a resident Chair and a proper Lectureship. Edgar was far from willing to commute and Malloch had to do his best on a part-time basis, in a way that must have proved far more difficult for a school-teacher than for the College Principals and Lecturers who lectured in Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities.

In St. Andrews itself what hope there was of enlarging the Chair's operation lay in a female direction. The enormous success of the LLA, the presence in St. Andrews of a major girls' Public School, along with attractive buildings and a safe and healthy atmosphere gave it a greater appeal to the middle class parents of girls than did the universities in the major cities and it was eventually to have a higher proportion of female students than any other university in the United Kingdom (41% in 1912-13).⁴⁷ Given that enthusiasm for (as yet voluntary) training among secondary teachers was at its highest among women, this female influx gave a useful boost to the size of Edgar's graduating classes, which elsewhere in Scotland had been kept going almost entirely by students with one foot in a college such as did not exist at St. Andrews. The university's reputation for the providing of personal tuition in small classes may also have provided a special attraction. In 1903 it had 75 full-time staff for 477 students at a time when Glasgow had 113 for 2219 and Edinburgh 112 for almost 3,000.⁴⁸ Moreover, the movement for the development of secondary schools seems to have awoken fresh educational interests among members of the St. Andrews Senate who were increasingly willing to lecture to students and local teachers not merely on their own subject but even on appropriate teaching methods⁴⁹ while Edgar's interest in research, often of a physiological nature,⁵⁰ gave him the entree to the scientific and

medical parts of the university largely closed to the literary Meiklejohn.

However, he seems to have confined his teaching entirely to the locality of St. Andrews and to have had none of Meiklejohn's ambition to expand into the larger city and in response to a request from the *School World* to describe the courses available for teachers in the University of St. Andrews, he completely ignored Dundee⁵¹ despite its being by this time an integral part of the university. The fact that plans for a Diploma of Secondary Teaching, similar to those in the other three universities, still failed to materialise probably reflects not so much opposition as the nature of Edgar and his classes as well as the tendency of many women students to be content with class tickets rather than Diplomas as at St. George's Edinburgh, where only a minority of the students actually aimed at full graduation or the Schoolmasters' Diploma.

In the absence of relevant autobiography it is difficult now to explain Edgar's isolation from Dundee, which at the end of his career was to become a matter of some contention (as we shall discuss later) though the financial arrangements culminating in the great quarrel of 1912-13 over the payment of Dundee fees to St. Andrews⁵² may well have played a part. Certainly Darroch, Laurie's successor in Edinburgh was to make a much greater mark on the educational scene than Edgar with all his scientific interests. Not only were Darroch's academic qualifications impressive but he already had a remarkable reputation in the Edinburgh philosophical world as a debater and lecturer. His qualities could produce purple prose even from a fellow Senate member who, not in an obituary but in an article on his *appointment*, described him as "one of the most distinguished philosophical students of his time, especially shining at the meetings in the house of Douglas at Bruntsfield Crescent."⁵³ Darroch had been a Medallist and Prizewinner in all the Edinburgh philosophy classes, a Rhind scholar and Heriot Research Fellow. Moreover he had not only worked initially as a parish schoolmaster, but had also had the now relevant experiences of working both in a Scottish Training College and in the University of Wales,⁵⁴ at that time pioneering the introduction of American research degrees to the British scene⁵⁵

- and all of this within 10 years of his first matriculation. "It is given to few men to achieve in so short a time not merely the academic distinction but the success such distinction merits" the eulogy concluded.

On Darroch as a teacher, views are mixed.⁵⁶ Bairstow, for example, felt that in that respect he was inferior to Clarke in Aberdeen⁵⁷ but what was to be more to the point was that Darroch turned out to be a highly skilful committee man and was eventually to chair not merely the future Edinburgh Provincial Committee but also, as the choice of Craik's successor Struthers, the first National Committee for the Training of Teachers. He was thus able to make his way in Senate politics and to some extent at least, in those dealings with government, that had sometimes been beyond the powers of the easily exasperated Laurie. He was certainly believed to influence Struthers⁵⁸ (although he did not always agree with him) and Anderson sees him as the purveyor of a fashionable "expert opinion" which influenced government.⁵⁹ However, it is easy to exaggerate his differences from Laurie, who had taught him and groomed him as his successor. Indeed he was to claim a commitment to Laurie's views⁶⁰ though as one later writer was to suggest, his continual search for agreement and consensus in committee could sometimes provide him with political success at the expense of a hitherto keenly held principle.

At the same time, there can be no doubt of his commitment to his educational ideals. His search for consensus at one particular meeting of a committee did not necessarily make him a continual trimmer. Like Laurie and Meiklejohn, he was certainly an advocate of greater freedom for the child⁶¹ and he became more and more outspoken, also, like Laurie, in his criticism of government even when it could clearly prejudice his dealings with the inspectorate and Struthers himself so that the dramatic nature of his eventual mysterious disappearance on Jura was a not inappropriate end to a somewhat turbulent career, that was much in the public eye.

His chief educational inspirer, apart from Laurie, was Dewey⁶² and to that extent

he has been attacked in recent years on the same grounds as Dewey himself. In particular, he is criticised by Anderson for seeing the child as a mere instrument of state policy, a tool to be made fit for its function in society,⁶³ just as Dewey has been attacked on similar grounds by the American Left,⁶⁴ but there is ample evidence that Darroch's view was a more balanced one than Dewey's and that the modern American emphasis on the adjustment of the child to society was less important to him than the protection of the liberty of the individual.⁶⁵ It is true that in his Inaugural, he saw education's aim as "to fit the individual to become a member of such or such a community" but he linked it to an attack on the examination system⁶⁶ and in a 1916 lecture to the WEA insisted that scientific and technical education was not enough. It must be founded on a solid basis of a liberal education.⁶⁷

More recently he has been the object of a new and considerable attack by Davie in an article⁶⁸ which, in its scope, bids fair to start a major controversy on the scale of that provoked by "The Democratic Intellect". The burden of the attack is that the SED, in seizing upon the Scottish universities as a cheap source of G interfered with the traditional balance of the Scottish Arts curriculum and, in pressing the changes of 1908 on the universities, finally killed off Philosophy as the basis of that curriculum. In this struggle the philosopher, Professor Burnet, of St. Andrews is cast as a hero fighting off the villainous Struthers and Darroch who by popularising Education as a new option among the hosts of teacher-trainees entering the universities, diverts them from Philosophy and damages the national cultural tradition. For Davie, explicitly, the utilitarian work of Darroch is part of the national degradation portrayed by McDiarmid in his "Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle".⁶⁹

All this is a major theme, as yet inadequately researched and discussed and is mentioned here only because Davie links it to the SED's parallel policy for modernising the Secondary School curriculum and he produces good evidence of a bitter public struggle between Struthers, the EIS and certain Professors (notably Burnet), which may well have affected SED attitudes in the other current battles over

teacher training. However, there is sufficient other evidence – the concurrent disappearance of philosophy from the general curriculum in Sweden, for example⁷⁰ – to suggest that the Scottish developments were inevitable reactions to a situation in which the universities now dealt with a much older age group with, for the first time, a general experience of secondary education as well as with a set of career structures, not least in teaching, which called for more specialisation. For such things, Darroch was hardly to blame.⁷¹

His early years in office were not marked by grand departures. He had been Laurie's assistant and during the latter's lifetime the Education class and the Schoolmaster's Diploma were maintained and developed much as they had been in the late 90s. By 1904 Edinburgh differed from the other universities in having no Local Committee but, given the numbers of College students seeking G, the St. George's students and other potential teacher undergraduates flocking to the Education classes, there seemed no threat to the future of the Chair. In such circumstances there might well have seemed no incentive to undertake the chore of running an extra university training centre that might well stir up the now dead opposition of the local colleges. However, Darroch's energy was such that he soon set about launching one.

Both locally and nationally, he was, however, destined to see very far-reaching changes in the world of Scottish teacher training which had great consequences for the Chair and as he took office, three movements in particular seemed to be gaining significant strength.

None of the three was new. The first was older than Darroch's chair itself and, indeed, Laurie had been a major leader of it. The call for the proper training and certification of secondary teachers had been strongly heard in the early 70s at the first meeting of the English Headmasters' Conference, had been confirmed by the work of Oscar Browning and the Cambridge Syndics and had led not merely to efforts at setting up an (abortive) Secondary Teachers College in England but to Laurie's

Schoolmaster's Diploma itself as well as to the ensuing (if less ambitious) diplomas in Glasgow and Aberdeen. Secondary training had been a key issue in the fight to establish a teachers register for the whole of Britain and the Teachers Guild, which, with Laurie as President, had led the fight, were convinced that once the Register was established it would only be a matter of time before it at least (if not TT) would be automatically a legal requirement for registration, and thus for employment in the secondary and not merely the elementary sectors of teaching, just as professional training was, they claimed, a requirement in all the other properly registered professions.⁷²

In the end, when it came, registration remained purely voluntary and was eventually to become a dead letter, though as Scottish teachers were to discover sixty years later with the establishment of their General Teaching Council, even a compulsory register can still be manipulated and even devalued by a government department that controls the conditions of employment. Even so, moves towards a general system at least of voluntary secondary training gained momentum throughout Britain. In Scotland where the training of elementary teachers was by 1900 almost universal the reluctance to accept enforcement of training on secondary teachers seems to have been less on the part of teachers unwilling to qualify than on that of employers whose refusal to require more than a degree was to continue to discourage honours students from training until after the first war. In 1900, however, it was assumed that enforcement was purely a matter of time, that large-scale arrangements would have to be made for such training and that the universities might well have a new role to play in all this. The new English universities were entering the field with enthusiasm, the Scottish Local Committees were experimenting with secondary courses and the scope for the Scottish Chairs in this matter had long ago occurred to both Laurie and Meiklejohn.⁷³ Even so, the SED, which under Craik had played a major part in developing the new post-elementary sector, would hardly be more likely than in 1874 to grant total control of such important issues as supply and

training to a set of autonomous universities with a vested interest in the development of the secondary system itself, both as a source of students and as the destination of so many graduates.

The second wave of enthusiasm gripping Scottish education in 1900 was for the Science of Education itself. The growth of the Child Study movement not least in Scotland, and certain aspects of the secondary training movement were manifestations of this, as was the increasing desire to adopt the proliferating models of educational study increasingly available outside the United Kingdom. Germany had always provided such an outside inspiration but now the British educational press was increasingly filled also with articles on recent developments in North America and other parts of Europe, though such an interest stretched right back to the Argyll Commission that had preceded the 1872 Act.

At first it was not certain which country would have the greatest influence in Britain. Even as late as 1911 Sandiford, a lecturer in Manchester was asking "Shall we model (our) London or Manchester Training College on the lines of the one at Columbia or shall we follow the example of the French and establish schools comparable to the primary higher normal schools of Fontenay aux Roses and Saint Cloud?"⁷⁴ and he could of course have added to these, the equally appropriate German examples of Jena and Berlin that had inspired the Scottish pioneers themselves.

In Scotland; however, while there continued to be much discussion of France and Germany, particularly in academic circles, it was increasingly the American models that won the day. Morgan, writing on Laurie in the *Secondary School Journal* noted that while there had been no American university Chairs in Education in 1876, by 1910 there were 250⁷⁵ and that such expansion implied a vision and vitality that would suit Scotland very well. Above all, it was the image of what Haldane called the "magnificent Training College for teachers linked to the Columbia University ... the centre of light and culture in the state of New York"⁷⁶ that seemed to catch the

Scottish imagination and it was certainly the image most constantly referred to by the leaders of the third movement making its presence felt once more in 1900 – the renewed and considerably strengthened movement calling not merely for chairs but for the establishment of Faculties of Education in each of the Scottish Universities. This cry for Faculties had of course characterised agitation by the EIS almost since its foundation and had been heard perennially in numerous congresses and petitions as well as in meetings of General Councils throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. It had, indeed, been partly responsible for the allocation of the Bell funds to the Chairs and for the funding of the lectureships at Glasgow and Aberdeen. It was now to be considerably strengthened by becoming the demand also of the NUT in England whose accession to the cause considerably increased its political influence.⁷⁷

It is true that the EIS spokesmen were not always united on what they meant by "Faculties of Education". Many teachers would no doubt have been happy with any arrangement that appeared to make the teachers equal with the lawyers, the doctors and the ministers, each of which had a Faculty of their own. Some, however, had a more complex vision, demanding not merely professors of education but a whole separate array of professors, who would teach each of the subjects of the school curriculum from a "teacher" point of view. Others sought the incorporation of the Colleges into the University proper, and still others the establishment of a new teachers' first degree combining the whole of G and TT such as eventually took shape with the post-Robbins BEd. But all were united in the belief that the Universities should provide more than merely G or even TP for the Scottish teaching profession and that they should stand at the centre of the country's teacher-training organisation.

In January 1905 a far-reaching minute of SED was published⁷⁸ that appeared to concede just that thing. In future the country's training procedures were to be organised in four regions or "provinces" based on the four universities and it seemed therefore that from now on the universities *would* preside over the system rather than

the Presbyterian churches whose colleges were now to be taken over by four new Provincial Committees. Up to the end of the century and beyond, SED had denied all intention of undertaking such secularisation or "nationalisation" of the colleges though there had been many pressures leading to it quite apart from the agitation of the EIS and the Secondary Education Association or the force of English and American examples.

Such an idea was at least as old as Lalor's prize-winning essay of 1839⁷⁹ and, of course, had lain behind the whole Chair movement. In the 1880s Ross had certainly looked forward to the amalgamation of the colleges and universities⁸⁰ and in his evidence to the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1891,⁸¹ Laurie wearing his Church hat, declared himself not opposed to just such a secularisation procedure. "The Church of Scotland," he believed, "(was) prepared to give up anything in the way of privilege if it can be shown to them that thereby you will produce a better schoolmaster for the country". Ten years later the *Glasgow Herald*, now converted to the idea of university involvement in teacher training, declared that although the Colleges had done good work in the past ... in all probability even their warmest admirers (would now) admit that they cannot long continue as they are. Either they must be taken over by the State and secularised, or they must be superseded by the Universities". A report of the Glasgow EIS (27 Apr 1901)⁸² stated firmly that "the training of teachers should be undertaken by the Universities" and the Colleges affiliated, with TT being made compulsory.

In June 1903, the EIS went further. Their Higher Education committee actually now advocated a scheme remarkably similar to what was eventually to appear - with teacher-training under SED control but organised at ground level by a board in each university centre, consisting of representatives of the universities, the local authorities and the teaching profession⁸³ and their pressure for the adoption of such ideas was kept up during 1904.⁸⁴

In the face of such pressures, SED must have already been examining some possible frameworks for change. Anderson⁸⁵ suggests that the decay of the pupil-teacher system made such change inevitable. Craik himself was becoming dissatisfied with a situation whereby, though 80% of teachers had been certificated, only two-thirds had actually been trained and as early as 1901 had suggested that the Colleges must "put their house in order" or they were "doomed"⁸⁶ and Findlay plausibly suggests that the 1905 Circular could hardly have appeared with such detailed proposals had there not been considerable preparation of the ground beforehand.⁸⁷ Such preparation could be seen as implying commitment. Even so as late as May 1904, the government's public commitment against nationalisation was still great enough to earn an attack from the *Scotsman*⁸⁸ which accused SED of continuing to support denominationalism in an ostensibly secular school system.

The attack on continued church control, of course, reflected the way in which the general politics of Westminster had in themselves led to a questioning of how not merely part but virtually all of a national system of training could remain in ecclesiastical hands at a time when not only Liberals but politicians in all parties were questioning the extent to which government should finance denominational schooling. In Scotland especially, the universities appeared to provide a truly national and academically acceptable alternative to the Churches as a non-governmental agency for the control of training, particularly if secondary teachers were now to be included. The government's main defence, that the Presbyterian churches had for long abandoned any interest in the day to day running of their colleges, simply weakened their earlier major arguments in favour of keeping church control i.e. that their work was based on a firm defence of Christian beliefs and values and at least as early as 1901 there were strong calls in parliament for the secularisation of the Scottish colleges and for the handing over of control to the universities,⁸⁹ such calls being based not merely on opposition to church control but also on costs, with one member suggesting that whereas a College student now cost £28 per annum, even students of

"very expensive" subjects at Glasgow University, such as science and medicine now cost only £16.

One reason for government delay may well have been that they were reasonably happy with things as they were. They were encouraged by the operation of the Local Committees which in a revised form might well not only provide a basis for the running of the whole system but could facilitate, without a full amalgamation, the use of university staff in the colleges thus both increasing the academic prestige of the latter and saving government outlay on extra staffing. Even so, in the field of secondary and graduate training which it was now hoped to expand, something demonstrably at a higher academic level than what was now provided in colleges was clearly required. By 1904, 75% of the male recruits to teaching were graduates. Even in the elementary sector, one third of all male teachers were graduates while most of the rest had university experience⁹⁰ and it was appropriate that the university sector should therefore have a greater say in their training, especially as much of it was often concurrent with university courses. Clearly, some sort of gesture to the universities, even a hand-over, began to seem politically defensible, if not desirable in civil servants' eyes.

Even so, SED appeared to resist such a scheme right up to the last moment, for the old arguments advanced against the chairs and university training, that they would finally take control of supply and curriculum out of government hands in a way that Church control did not, were still potent ones particularly in Treasury circles. Indeed, as in 1875-6, there may well in the first years of the new century have been arguments between Scottish ministers and the Treasury over just such issues even if the appearance of Carnegie money had eased the situation.

Despite Findlay's belief that the whole operation was being planned for some time, the Lord Advocate in his parliamentary defence of the *status quo*, seemed to fall back on almost every anti-university argument that had been used for the previous thirty

years, emphasising the large/small division, expressing worries over students' morals and even asserting, as Cross had asserted in refusing the Chair subsidies, that he was not convinced that it was what the people of Scotland wanted.⁹¹

In the end, whatever the balance of opinion within the government and SED itself, there is evidence that the growing influence of Struthers, who succeeded Craik just as the new plan was launched, may well have tipped the balance. However, change would have become virtually inevitable in any case as a result of a series of events quite outside the government's hands.

In 1900 the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church had agreed to join forces in a new United Free Church. This decision had been disputed by a small minority of the Free Church who believed it represented a change in doctrine and thereby a betrayal of those who had endowed the Church financially. The minority, on that basis, claimed the right to control all the former Free Church's property, including the three teacher training colleges, a claim eventually rejected by the Court of Session in July 1902. However, an appeal to the Lords, which became extremely protracted as a result of the death of one of the judges, actually succeeded and in August 1904, the decision of the Court of Session was overturned and all the property of the "old" Free Church was awarded to the "Wee Frees". During the immediate crisis, the various educational bodies of the new United Church had to seek refuge elsewhere, including the classrooms of Glasgow and Edinburgh universities.⁹² Not only was the body, now officially to be in charge of the Free Church colleges, small and relatively poor, it was unlikely to pursue the policy of religious tolerance which had become normal in such colleges and which was essential as a condition of SED support and political peace. Doubts about the ability of a major element in the teacher training structure to carry on its activities in the accustomed way forced the government to abandon their earlier disclaimers of any intention to tamper with the current system.

Parliament had intervened in the dispute and a Commission had been appointed to work out a more satisfactory allocation of the churches' assets. No doubt, the new United Free Church might well, had parliament so decided, have taken up once more the teacher training role of the former Free Church but the swiftness of government action suggests that a chance to make more profound changes was now being seized.⁹³ Three months before the Commission reported, the SED published its minute of January 1905 (coinciding with Struthers' appointment) announcing the establishment of new bodies to take over the running of the major Presbyterian Colleges in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen and to organise an entirely new system of teacher-training. It provided that "Each Committee (should) have power to provide, whether in University classes or otherwise, courses of instruction suitable for the training of teachers". The aim, it was emphasised, was not just to cope with an emergency, but "to enlarge and improve existing facilities" and to bring training into "as close connection with the University organisations as the attainments of the students upon entering admit of and to provide means whereby School Boards and others directly interested in the question ... of ... supply ... shall be in a position to secure due consideration for their views".

Significantly the strongest opposition to the plan was to come not from the Churches who subsequently were unwilling even to maintain their responsibility for the teachers' religious training⁹⁴ but from the School Boards who (with the apparent exceptions of Glasgow and Govan) were worried about the financial aspects and no doubt were beginning to covet the increasing role that was being played by the English local authorities in the organisation of teacher-training. Such training, the Forfar Board made clear, was intimately associated with the whole educational system and no attempt should be made to deal with the part out of relation to the whole⁹⁵ and such protests ensured that local authorities were eventually to be awarded a major role in the new Provincial Committee system.

The EIS, on the other hand, naturally welcomed the proposed new links with the

universities while the Glasgow University General Council, in which Institute members played a major part, saw it as presenting an immediate opportunity for the final establishment of Faculties of Education.⁹⁶

Such an emphasis on the universities' role had figured strongly in Craik's rhetoric immediately before the announcement and continued into his retirement for he seemed to have abandoned his old use of the churches as the means whereby SED could, superficially at any rate, distance itself from ultimate responsibility for teacher training. In a speech at Dundee, for example,⁹⁷ he declared that "The teachers will now be a profession not trained above or in seclusion but side by side with the great intellectual interests of the country, recruited from the same source as the other learned professions, widened in their intellectual range and stimulated in their energies by the wider sympathy that will thus be gained". This was the perennial EIS case in a nutshell. Yet in the dispute over the St. Andrews/Dundee plan he had claimed that the provision of training facilities was a matter not for him but for religious bodies and the continued necessary existence of the Roman Catholic College had also been used from time to time to justify this position. He probably now wished to have the universities take over the Churches' role - possibly as a scape-goat when things went badly but in the meantime as the bestowers of prestige and academic respectability but also as the provider of cheap teaching. Certainly, a university take-over was politically more desirable than a complete state take-over especially as comparisons would inevitably be drawn with an increasingly pluralist teacher-training sector in England. He was also clearly aware of the colleges' poor image and felt, ostensibly at any rate, that their admission to "a more liberal commonwealth" might well increase public confidence, bestowing greater esteem both on them and on teachers in the public sector.

Moreover, such a plan fitted into current policy. In 1901 the colleges had been given greater freedom to decide their own curriculum. Morgan spoke of it somewhat exaggeratedly as their "charter of liberty"⁹⁸ and a greater role for the university might

well help the directing of such liberty into more fruitful paths. Certainly many Scottish members of parliament had thought that for some time, notably N.W. Douglas, while Haldane, influential both as an MP and as a philosopher, had advocated a remarkably similar scheme to that of 1905 some three years earlier⁹⁹ significantly linking it both to his reference to Columbia Teachers College, quoted above, and to the proposal in the abortive 1904 Education Bill for the establishment of 39 new local authorities. Haldane had made an additional proposal for an upper tier of Provincial Councils based on the four catchment areas of the universities, by which the influence of the latter could be brought to bear upon the (new) system of secondary education. Such an idea, eventually taken up by government in the 1904 Bill had met with a warm response, the main disputes being over the proposed boundaries of such provinces, with the eastern universities disputing Glasgow's wide claims in a way that recalls later misgivings over the dominance of Strathclyde in the local government reorganisation of the 1970s.

In December 1904, the Scottish correspondent of the *Teachers Guild Quarterly* had suggested that Haldane's Provincial Councils would have been apt bodies to organise teacher-training,¹⁰⁰ an idea that had apparently already occurred to Struthers.¹⁰¹ Thus the four new bodies to organise teacher training were, significantly, given the name of Provincial Committees in the Act of 1908 and their creation offered government more than mere political benefits and a way round the "Church question" of 1904. Already a major part of G was being provided for a majority of students by the university sector and many were also receiving various forms of T. The new committees anxious to provide extra income for their local university and to pursue the teachers' aim of a Faculty of Education might well organise a greater integration of university and college staffs, thus providing high-level part-time teaching by university staff in the colleges at considerably less cost than would have been the case if a new, more modern curriculum had had to be staffed entirely in the public sector itself. This, indeed, had been one of the attractions of the Day Training scheme launched in

England in the 90s. Some university staff, notably in Glasgow and Aberdeen, were already involved in college teaching. This was to be considerably expanded and to prove so highly successful in ensuing decades, especially in Aberdeen, that Knight, in his first year as a university lecturer in Psychology found himself personally responsible for the lecture and laboratory work of 1,400 students, both inside and outside the university.¹⁰²

Even so, as Findlay has pointed out, despite Craik's rhetoric the 1905 Minute could "not by any stretch of the imagination" be construed as actually increasing the responsibility of the universities for training.¹⁰³ Yet many people thought it did and it met with "almost unqualified approval".¹⁰⁴ The Editor of *Educational News* "speaking for a profession which believes that at long last it is finding itself properly ... based on the only safe and sure foundation in the university", wished God-speed to the new committees "in their great and national work".¹⁰⁵ The changes were welcomed also by the Edinburgh Senate,¹⁰⁶ while Donaldson saw them as "a revolution" which would ensure that "most of the future teachers in Scottish schools would henceforth obtain their culture in Scottish universities".¹⁰⁷

For the universities, the new scheme was certainly promising. At first sight, it would apparently give them greater control over the education of that major part of their Arts Faculty that was now engaged in teacher training and would give them a greater say in the training of the new higher grade and secondary teachers who were increasingly producing their own recruits. Chrystal, the Maths professor at Edinburgh believed that "a modest beginning was made in what he believed would be a great revolution in the educational history of the country. The new scheme ... will attain a magnitude which very very few people perhaps anticipate."¹⁰⁸

Chrystal's optimism, however, like that of most of his university colleagues, was based on the assumption that government would give them a relatively free hand and Craik's speeches of early 1905 had certainly encouraged such optimism.

In speaking thus, however, Craik was no doubt aware of government's continual need to win political approval just as his successor Struthers was to demonstrate, before the year was out, that he in turn was aware of the government's other imperative – that the control of teacher supply and curriculum expansion must be kept firmly in government hands, and though there must remain the possibility of genuine differences of apprehension between the two men there is evidence that they acted in consort. Stocks talks of "deliberate attempts to mislead" and bases his judgement of Craik's behaviour on what he sees as his perennial refusal to take the university's handling of training seriously, evidenced by many earlier statements beginning with an anonymous article of 1879,¹⁰⁹ and ending with his expression of doubts about the workings of the Local Committees.¹¹⁰ However against this conspiracy theory is the evidence that his "misleading" rhetoric was still being indulged twelve years later.¹¹¹

What is certain is that at the end of 1905 as an apparent gesture of goodwill to the new Committees, Struthers made a point of being present at all four inaugural meetings. He intimated that SED would soon be submitting to them new regulations for their consideration but immediately gave them pause by emphasising "that it should be clearly understood that the Secretary for Scotland must be solely responsible for the shape in which they are ultimately laid before parliament ..."¹¹² Over the next ten years he was to demonstrate that this position as final arbiter was a crucial one. Any freedom that the Committees were to enjoy were to be enjoyed within strict governmental parameters. The Committees (and certainly not the University Courts, whose role seemed less and less significant in these matters) were being given not even a limited blank cheque. Each item of expenditure and policy was to be accounted for to Dover House.

Moreover, although Struthers no doubt accepted the value of saving expenditure by encouraging university teachers to provide G or T or to perform in colleges, he did not necessarily welcome this on educational grounds. If adequate college teaching was already available and was being paid for, there was no need, he felt, for *any*

university involvement. In relation to a proposed 1907 arrangement in Aberdeen for example, he noted that he could not "altogether accept what seems to be the underlying postulate of (their) scheme viz. that instruction given by persons who happen to be officers of the University is necessarily and inherently better ... than that given by persons specially selected by the Committee themselves"¹¹³ and noted the irritating administrative difficulty of tying professors down.

His encounters with the Aberdeen Committee at this period are particularly well chronicled owing to the survival of letters, telegrams and memos that Struthers exchanged with the interested parties, especially with Sellar, head of an Aberdeenshire firm manufacturing agricultural implements, who had been made Convenor of the sub-committee of the Provincial Committee charged with negotiating any university involvement in college teaching. In fact Sellar seemed rapidly to develop a mistrust not only of the University Court but of Smith, the new Committee's Director of Studies as well as of Dey, the chairman of his own Committee and chairman of what had been the highly successful Aberdeen Local Committee. Sensing some fellow-feeling in Struthers, Sellar, despite his comparatively low rank in the administrative hierarchy, soon proceeded openly to criticise and to plot against all his opponents in a series of confidential communications and even meetings with the Secretary of the SED. He did not find it difficult to convince Struthers of his developing viewpoint that the Provincial Committee would find it better to appoint their own men than to use university figures. Scotland, who has written extensively on this episode,¹¹⁴ sees this as a natural result of the Professors' refusal to accept outside inspection, quoting Struthers' adverse opinion: "The truth is that the professors as a body walled up in their impenetrable fortress of academic seclusion are like the Bourbons. They have learned nothing by experience and can forget nothing of their privileges ... if we are to get a broader conception of education instilled among the teachers of the north-east ... the University is the last agency in the world through which we are likely to obtain it", but it no doubt reflects also the

bitterness of his current struggle over the university Arts curriculum to which Davie has drawn attention.¹¹⁵ He believed, he claimed, that Professors would simply produce teachers capable of cramming for bursaries and would not pursue the wider curricular aims that SED had in mind. Perhaps, more to the point, they would do *whatever* they did, outside his control.

Naturally, the Aberdeen professors were justifiably taken aback. They more than any of the Senates, had expected a new era of cooperation. For over a decade they had built up an ever closer relationship with the college sector and had been determined to press their advantage home. In January 1904 Clarke, the University's Lecturer in Education, proposed a development of teacher-training arrangements that would fill a gap that the 1904 Bill had left unfilled.¹¹⁶ In December 1904 the Senate felt that an opportunity was slipping away from them¹¹⁷ and in a somewhat crude gesture, at the first opportunity after the publication of the 1905 Minute, they had awarded Struthers an honorary degree. Yet in the following years he had shown nothing but ingratitude. As Principal Lang pointed out, the government was actually encouraging and financing the taking over of teacher training by the new English universities while Aberdeen, under Dey's enthusiastic guidance, had for some years run Scotland's most successful Local Committee whose work had been continually praised in successive Blue Books by the SED's own inspectors. Even Sellar himself believed that in opening his negotiations with the Court he had been following Struthers' own policy. "From the conversation I had with you, the idea of getting existing institutions such as the Universities ... to undertake all the work for us is just what you aim at", he wrote but Struthers guardedly warned him that such arrangements "might have good or bad results according to the exact nature of the arrangements"¹¹⁸ and suggested that a talk rather than correspondence on such a subject would be better for both of them. It was clear that while saving money was important, the monitoring of control was pre-eminent.

Indeed there appears to have been a growing view in SED at this time that the

school curriculum could be more effectively served (and supervised?) if exclusively college lecturers were employed even in the G stage of at least non-secondary teacher preparation.¹¹⁹ The Inspector of Colleges, Scougal was at first non-committal on university involvement. In his report for 1906 he noted the "suspense and expectancy" to be found in the colleges as a result of the Minute of 1905 but he believed that, in any case, "Their tone has risen very appreciably; it has become much more healthy - more academic and professional, if I may so put it - and has ceased to be that of the "crammer's" school or the "coaching" college." Hence, by the time of writing his report for the Blue Book of 1908-09 his tone is much more belligerent, recalling the later stages of Struthers' Aberdeen correspondence. He notes how students are now no longer universally allowed to take Logic, Psychology, Ethics and Education at the University if they are provided by a local College. "The special aim ... is to treat the elements ... in their direct relation to the work of the school teachers." And while accepting that much of G and T is still in the hands of university teachers, he notes that "While this system is not without its advantages, experience is showing that it has its drawbacks. There is a danger that the subjects may be treated almost entirely, if not exclusively from the academic side instead of in their direct relation to educational theory and practice and when they are in the hands of lecturers who are not officers directly under the Provincial Committee it is not easy to secure concentration of aim and adequate correlation", adequacy no doubt being determined by an inspectorate keen to oversee the curriculum.

After 1910, Scougal's successor Smith instituted supervisory conferences for theory and methods lecturers "in the cause of mutual understanding"¹²⁰ but it is clear from the comments of both Struthers and Scougal that they at least saw the Provincial Committees and their employees as being ranged *against* university employees as two separate categories and this cast considerable doubt on whether even at this early stage the notion of any real integration with the universities, such as Craik appeared to envisage in his speeches of 1905, was ever seriously entertained

by SED. In other words, as Donaldson soon realised, any real control of these committees' operations by the universities was "only nominal".¹²¹

At the same time, one has to admit that the situation was confused. For many years, the Blue Book described the situation as one of "transition" and in scorning university teaching, SED officials may well have had book-keeping in mind as much as control of the school curriculum for numerous "university officers" were then and for many years later employed concurrently by University and Provincial Committee. In such an atmosphere it was not surprising therefore that those who wished to preserve the vision of Teacher's College Columbia or even the EIS's traditional Scottish Faculty found it hard going.

The January 1905 minute had met with general approval in the Edinburgh Senate where it was seen as a natural development of the work of the Local Committees, one of which they had decided to set up in Edinburgh only three months previously.¹²² Far from abandoning that idea, they assumed it would fit easily into the new scheme. On the 19th of January the *Student* noted that the universities were about to play a much bigger part in the work of preparing teachers and on the 4th of March as if the old order had not changed, the Senate instructed Darroch to proceed to recruit King's Students i.e. Committee-organised students, "for the purpose of being trained as teachers".¹²³ They even (as a gesture of goodwill to government) rejected a further motion proposing that they should avoid such action until SED had allowed Senate to elect its own representatives to the Provincial Committee and until Perth and Inverness had been included in Edinburgh's province. Darroch and Chrystal proceeded with their Local Committee (old style) and recruited 103 students in 1906-07,¹²⁴ no doubt assuming this to be a natural element in the make-up of any future Edinburgh system, especially as their Local Committee was a distinguished one including representatives of the Merchant Company, St. George's Training Centre and the Heriot Trust and thus heavily weighted towards the encouragement of the secondary training, as yet undeveloped in the Colleges.

The first inspector's report on the Edinburgh Committee's work spoke of Darroch's "wisdom and foresight"¹²⁵ just as it spoke also of the Dundee Centre's widening of its work beyond King's Students, envisaging what did, in fact, take place, a gradual merging of the work of the old Local Committees and the new Provincial Committees.

However, in 1909,¹²⁶ Darroch's views took a controversial turn. Possibly seeking a means of outwitting the Struthers/Scougal policy of re-establishing college control over the teaching of certain subjects, and of eradicating the Local Committee system, in an address to the EIS Congress in Stirling he placed new emphasis on the American Teacher's College model, suggesting that the Scottish colleges should gradually also become purely professional schools "for the practical training of the various classes of teachers", while all further instruction which students might need (i.e. all of G and T) should be given in the universities. He also suggested that the university and college might issue a combined degree or diploma in Education "analogous to the degree in engineering issued jointly by Edinburgh University and Heriot-Watt College", in other words, something approaching the post-Robbins BEd. However the EIS, while accepting the conditions of his proposals on the whole, reacted negatively to the idea of a special degree or diploma for teachers. They felt it would be "a fatal mistake for the profession to cut itself adrift from the broad full life of the universities and segregate itself as a class apart in any professional school" and had little interest in a diploma "of which they knew nothing".¹²⁷ Certainly their language recalled not merely the views of Laurie but also the rhetoric of Craik in his 1905 speeches and it seems to have been this view that carried the day, especially as there was current anxiety over an SED proposal to limit further the numbers allowed to take the full concurrent university/college courses. In Glasgow for example the number of students taking university classes had dropped from 555 in 1908-09 to 328 in 1910-1911 and showed no signs of improving.

This last development clearly owed something to Struthers' known opposition to concurrent training¹²⁸ and seemed even more sinister in the universities' eyes when

set against first, his other proposals to build a totally new college in Dundee in competition with the ailing St. Andrews/Dundee Committees and second, against the known policy of government in England, where Morant was now also seen to be discouraging elementary teacher attendance at university.¹²⁹ The irony was that Struthers' main intention may even have been to save the universities from themselves and to preserve their academic purity. Findlay, for one, suggests that for him their *raison d'être* remained teaching and research, undisturbed by considerations of making a living,¹³⁰ a romantic, English view totally out of line with Scottish tradition and, incidentally, totally out of line with the instrumental, anti-philosophic attitude to education ascribed to him by Davie.

Much of the work of the Provincial Committees was initially concerned with property and buildings and the SED somewhat surprisingly encouraged all four Committees to embark on major building projects, partly to update the facilities, partly to cope with the overcrowding of the colleges that had led to the setting up of the Glasgow Local Committee, but also to ensure that there would be ample room to admit all the secondary teachers who, under the new regulations, were at last to be compelled to undergo a proper course of training. Struthers no doubt wished to ensure that there would be no physical excuse for allowing graduate training to slip back into the universities and again place the colleges' economies in jeopardy, for in addition Laurie's Schoolmaster's Diploma and the equivalent diplomas in Aberdeen and Glasgow were no longer to be recognised, in Scotland at least, and the growth of the Secondary Teachers' Diploma in the English Universities was now becoming too attractive a model, for Struthers not to take counter-measures.

These, however, were not easy. The take-over of the Presbyterian Colleges was subject to great legal delay, and not until 1910 were the first moves made to build a major new building at Moray House to integrate the work of the two Edinburgh colleges. No doubt this was one reason why the development of secondary training went badly. It had been difficult enough to tempt candidates to take the university

diplomas and even more difficult to get employers to recognise them. In 1910 out of a total recruitment of 849 at the Edinburgh Centre only 9 registered for the secondary course.¹³¹ In Glasgow, in 1911 out of a total of 4,596 in training there were only 13 looking for the higher certificate in secondary work¹³² even though one of the specific aims of the Provincial Committee system was to encourage such training and the press blamed school managers who still attached little importance to whether candidates in posts had been trained or not. In fact, of course, SED could at any time have insisted, had questions of supply and costs of training not been involved. Instead they fixed on 1915 as the year when training should be complete though it was not until between the wars that training finally became universal. Meanwhile the universities' own initiatives in the field of TT, that is the diplomas and the work of the Local Committees had been finally stopped.

In the light of such slow progress it was not surprising that the Scottish correspondent of the English *School World* could report in November 1909:

"It cannot be said that these committees have in any way realised the expectations with which their advent was heralded. It was generally believed that these bodies would act in some measure as advisory councils or consultative committees to the Department. Instead they have proved to be mere phonographs for reproducing departmental records. No vestige of real power has been permitted them and not a penny can be expended without the previously obtained sanction of the Department. They have indeed much less say in determining the nature and scope of ... training ... than the old denominational bodies that they replaced ... it would be better to abolish them altogether and leave the Department with the shadow, as it already has the substance of control."

and such a backlash of the disillusioned was widespread. The Reverend John Smith now made his famous reference to SED, already quoted, as "as absolute an autocracy as it is possible to imagine under any modern regime".¹³³

The *Teachers Guild Quarterly* described SED as "almighty"¹³⁴ and Darroch himself was finally constrained at the opening meeting of the Edinburgh Provincial Committee in February 1915 to protest that "it was absurd for committees charged with such

important work ... to be at the mercy of the minutes of the Education Department." Then curiously echoing almost word for word without acknowledgement the *School World's* phonograph metaphor of six years earlier, (had he himself coined it?) he asserted that the Provincial Committees were "the biggest sham in the educational world and the sooner they are ended or amended the more creditable it will be for the country."¹³⁵ And later in the year, in the Demonstration School itself, he was to warn "that too much stress ought not to be placed on the reports of H.M. Inspectors ... one of the best ways of economising at the present moment was to reduce their number."¹³⁶ Significantly this was uttered during the period when Scougal, the enemy of university teaching and former inspector of Colleges, returned to his old job as his war-work while his successor was in the army. He thus resumed contact with committees that some were now calling "Struthers' gaspipes".¹³⁷

There is then evidence not only that Darroch became disillusioned but that he placed the blame for what he saw as a disastrous failure squarely on a deceitful and secretive SED, who were shortly to suspend the publication of individual inspector's reports in favour of a more anonymous and monolithic statement of departmental views in the Blue Books of the post-war period. Yet, in the view of Cruickshank, Scotland and most other critics the nationalisation of the colleges and the establishment of the Provincial Committees, far from being a disaster, represented the dawn of a new era during which the college system went from strength to strength. Cruickshank for example, speaks of the new system as "rational and efficient"¹³⁸ and "representative of the public interest",¹³⁹ "altogether, teacher-training had received a great impulse".¹⁴⁰

In one respect, even Darroch would have admitted they were right. It soon became clear that whatever the reason for the rigidity of SED control it was on this occasion not primarily parsimony. In 1906, Carnegie largely abandoned its support of Scottish teacher education, yet there was no dramatic change in the pattern of provision for what was becoming increasingly expensive teacher-training. Despite

Struthers' caution over the cost of employing university staff, the money allocated to building and physical developments was, even by American standards, lavish. Moray House was to have unique experimental laboratories, Jordanhill was to be the largest Teachers Training Centre in Britain, while even the pioneers in Dundee were allowed to build a college so large and ambitious that two years after it opened, its numbers were so inadequate that the government had to consider closing and selling it.¹⁴¹ All the colleges were so large as to be under-subscribed until the late 1940s and although this can in fact be ascribed to the vagaries of supply forecasting, it must also be said that caution hardly characterised their early planning. Indeed, government ministers were even known to spur Provincial Committees into expenditure hitherto considered unnecessary in Scotland. In September 1910, echoing English cries of a century earlier, Shaw, the Lord Advocate, called for what might prove extremely expensive residential colleges in order "to overcome the coarseness" of Scottish students in training¹⁴² and a few months later all but the Dundee centre were, with no apparent Treasury disapproval, contemplating the adoption of a policy of compulsory residence for all those not living at home.¹⁴³ It is reasonable to conclude therefore that the real motivation of SED policy in 1905 as in 1876 was less the saving of money than the retention of control over supply and curriculum and this suggests that even if the University professors and lecturers had been willing to opt for purely secondary training in the English style (which Darroch and Boyd the new Lecturer in Glasgow certainly were not), Struthers would still have moved against them.

The introduction of the Provincial Committees proved therefore a disappointment to those in the EIS and elsewhere who had seen in their establishment a real incorporation of teacher training into the university world and a real definition of function for the university's Chairs and Lectureships in education. The *Educational News* expressed "shock" at discovering that "stripped of all verbiage", the SED's view was "that a University course is not the best for the teacher of the primary school".¹⁴⁴

Indeed, far from marking progress, much ground had been lost. The one definite attempt by government to use the universities for training through the Local Committee of 1896 had been finally ended. The number of college students able to attend university lectures had been drastically reduced as a definite act of government policy and as a result of the lengthening of the University year.¹⁴⁵ The diplomas which the universities had awarded in the field of secondary training and which had compared favourably with similar developments in England were no longer recognised and had in case, except in Glasgow, been quickly and probably foolishly abandoned as an act of goodwill to what at first appeared to be a benign new system. And while the exchanges of staff (normally in a college direction) did sporadically continue and, indeed, took place on a large scale in Aberdeen (despite Struthers' earlier doubts)¹⁴⁶ the internal Arts courses in Education inevitably lost numbers as the number of concurrent students was reduced and secondary training became more and more a matter of post-graduate training in the colleges.¹⁴⁷ Even the residual commitment of the universities to the teacher-training world through membership of the Provincial Committees became somewhat tenuous. Despite the Provinces being based on and named after the universities, their membership of the Committees was far from dominant and while it is true that individual figures like Darroch and Boyd played a prominent role, there was never any guarantee that even the university members would be full-time academics. Indeed Boyd sat on the Glasgow one not as a university member but as a nominee of the Ayrshire Labour Party.¹⁴⁸ Court members who were not on the university staff were often appointed as university representatives on the Provincial Committee because of their real interests as Lord Provosts or as local businessmen, rather than representatives of academic life. Indeed, the absence of adequate numbers of professors on the Provincial Committees was to be a complaint well into the 1940s, as Calder, the Edinburgh Dean of Arts made clear to McClelland's Advisory Council Committee.¹⁴⁹ On the other hand, it was natural, as the *Scottish Educational Journal* admitted, that "those who pay the piper should have some say in the calling of the tune"¹⁵⁰ and local government

representatives played a more and more important role in the work both of the Provincial Committees and, in 1919, of the National Committee which oversaw the work of all four, a development, Findlay believed, to be in tune with Struthers' view that on these Committees the University representatives were to be merely advisers while matters of action were for the ratepayers' representatives.¹⁵¹

Thus visions of American Teachers Colleges and of Faculties to set alongside Law and Medicine had, by the end of the first war, largely receded, though the EIS's traditional rhetoric and the development of a new role for the Professors and Lecturers in Education, were to keep the Faculty idea alive for many decades while the vision of Columbia itself was to come alive again (somewhat unexpectedly) in 1925 through a variety of circumstances, still not guessed at in 1905, in which other American models were also to play a part.

NOTES

1. Professor Dickson had opposed the St. Andrews proposal in 1895, as was noted in the previous chapter, but there is no evidence of widespread local support.
2. Glas Sen 28 Nov 1901.
3. Glas Sen 6 Mar 1902.
4. Glas C 9 May 1902.
5. Glas Sen 28 Jul 1876. Even Dickson joined in a move to reorganise the unsuccessful 1875 arrangements.
6. Glas Sen 2 Aug 1877.
7. Glas Sen 1 Mar 1877.
8. Glas Sen 8 Feb 1877.
9. This was made clear in Ramsay's evidence to the University Commissioners (18 Jan 1893) 1900 Univ Comm p 318.
10. Glas Sen 22 Feb 1883.
11. Glas C 26 Nov 1883.
12. Smith (1913) p 173.
13. Glas C 21 Sep 1886.
14. Glas C 8 May 1890.
15. Glas C 11 Jan 1894.
16. Glas C 8 Mar 1894.
17. This by-passing of the Senate by the Court on a mainly academic matter parallels a similar procedure over the subsequent Education degree. This is discussed in chapter 5 below.
18. Glas Sen 21 Mar 1895.
19. Glas Sen 17 Apr 1895.
20. Glas Sen 1 Dec 1898.
21. Glas Sen 16 Feb 1899.
22. Glas Sen 19 Jan 1899.
23. Glas Sen 28 Nov 1901.
24. Glas Sen 6 Mar 1902.

25. Glas C 18 Jun 1896.
26. C C Report 1902. Scougal's Report p 277.
27. Glas Sen 19 Feb 1903.
28. Glas Sen 19 Mar 1903.
29. *School World* Nov 1904.
30. *College Courant* Vol XVIII No 36 p 101.
31. Glas Sen 6 Mar 1902.
32. This is further evidence of a general Scottish lack of enthusiasm for Secondary training. Laurie, probably rightly, blamed it on the indifference of school managers, who refused to make training mandatory on recruits. *Journal of Education (Scotland)* May 1895 p 256.
33. *Aberdeen University Review* Feb 1914.
34. "Students at King's may now be divided into two classes, those who are going in for teaching and those who are not." *Alma Mater* 14 Dec 1910.
35. One of the earliest, for example, in a motion by the General Council at its meeting of 15 Apr 1896, though in *Alma Mater* 29 Oct 1890, it had been noted that the establishment of a Chair had figured in plans for the new Arts curriculum.
36. This is mentioned in the Glasgow discussion of the possible use of Bell funds. Glas Sen 22 Feb 1883.
37. *Aberdeen University Review* Nov 1939.
38. Part-time, according to Grierson, because of the continuing burden of paying for the rebuilding of Marischal College. Peddie (1951) p 43 specifically claims that the Aberdeen Lectureship was endowed by Carnegie.
39. *Joseph Ogilvie and his First Twenty One Classes* (1896) p 21. He had been appointed head of the Established Church College by Laurie and was the brother of the HMI. It was said that no other family could boast as many LLDs. *Alma Mater* 24 Oct 1894.
40. *Aberdeen University Review* Nov 1914.
41. *Alma Mater* 14 Dec 1898. The role of those students had become of such significance in the University, that Dey was asked to write a long article for the student magazine explaining how they differed from ordinary teacher-trainees. *Alma Mater* 9 Nov 1898.
42. Kerr (1910-13).
43. Judd (1914).

44. Anderson (1983) p 356.
45. According to his pupil, the later St. Andrews Professor, Skinner, in a BQ interview.
46. Rusk, in a BQ interview, described him as "frail", though he admired him enough to forward material by him to Ballard. Ballard (1923) p 15.
47. Maclean (1917) p 57.
48. *Ibid.* p 64.
49. Burnet, for example, addressed the Secondary Teachers Association on Educational Methods. *College Echoes* Nov 1914.
50. In 1904, for example, he addressed the University Education Society on the relevance of physiology to education and eight months later was involved in a Sanitary Congress. *School World* Jan & Sep 1904.
51. *School World* Dec 1904.
52. *School World* Aug 1913.
53. *Student* 19 Jan 1905.
54. Thomas (1983) p 131 notes that he was not the only Scot on the scene. Mackie who became professor in Sydney was also there.
55. Bell (1965).
56. See further discussion of this in chapter 8.
57. In BQ interview.
58. BQ interview with Wright.
59. Anderson (1983) p 234.
60. Darroch (1903). In the Preface he mentions his indebtedness to Pringle-Pattison and Laurie "the spirit of (whose) teaching will be evident to every critical reader".
61. Mark (1913) p 209 quotes his attack on the school system's restraint of the child's "instructive tendencies to action" and "free play of the organs of the body".
62. In Darroch (1914) for example, Dewey is a "typical representative of the most forward school of educational thought".
63. Anderson (1983) p 234, echoing an attack by the editor of *School World* in Sep 1914.
64. Lasch (1969) p 165 "At its worst, the idea that education was the answer to all social problems degenerated into the jargon of the efficiency experts".

65. At an Edinburgh meeting of the EIS in 1904, for example, he was to be found attacking the State for exceeding its proper functions (*School World* Apr 1904).
66. Darroch (1906) pp 12–13.
67. *School World* Jul 1916.
68. Davie (1985) p 41 ff.
69. McDiarmid (1926).
70. Lindroth (1976) p 224.
71. Playfair had been calling for just such a wider and more specialist curriculum as long ago as 1870. Anderson (1983) pp 87–8.
72. *Teachers Guild Quarterly passim*
73. In 1904 *School World* ran a monthly series on the new training opportunities in each of the British universities in turn.
74. *School World* Feb 1911.
75. *Secondary School Journal* Jan 1910.
76. Haldane (1902) p 63. The College was still sufficiently new to cause great international excitement. It had been founded in 1889 as New York College, and became part of Columbia in 1892. Brubacher (1947) p 519.
77. In their evidence to the Bryce Commission, the English NUT had recommended that training colleges should be situated in university towns and a Faculty of Education created in connection with the universities (Bryce Evidence 8791–812).
78. Reproduced in C C Reports 1905 p 223 Minute dated 30 Jan 1905 "providing for the establishment of Committees for the Training of Teachers".
79. Lalor (1839) p 122.
80. *Educational News* 7 Apr 1883, for example.
81. 1900 Univ Comm Evidence p 340.
82. Reproduced by Knight (1902) in Appendix.
83. *School World* June 1903.
84. *Educational News* 12 Mar 1904, 20 Aug 1904.
85. Anderson (1983) p 233.
86. Knight (1902) p 64.
87. Findlay (1979) p 84.

88. *Scotsman* 31 May 1904.
89. Hansard, Commons, 10 May 1901 c 1411 ff.
90. *School World* Dec 1904.
91. Hansard, Commons 21 Jun 1901.
92. Glas Sen 27 Oct 1904.
93. *School World* Jan 1905. "The intolerable situation ... is likely to have one unsatisfactory result. Several conferences have taken place between Sir Henry Craik and Mr Struthers on the one hand and the Education Committees of the churches on the other".
94. *School World* Jul 1906. The Churches and the Provincial Committees both wanted each other to accept responsibility for this.
95. *School World* Mar 1906.
96. In a memo on the 1904 Education Bill they had clearly expressed the view that "the time seems particularly opportune for inviting the universities ... to identify themselves more closely with the training of teachers". Glas G C 4 May 1904.
97. *School World* Mar 1905.
98. *School World* Sep 1903.
99. Haldane (1902) p 57.
100. *Teachers Guild Quarterly* 15 Dec 1904.
101. Note initialled by Struthers 12 Jun 1917 (SRO).
102. *Aberdeen University Review* Autumn 1966.
103. Findlay (1979) p 90.
104. *Teachers Guild Quarterly* Jun 1905.
105. *Educational News* 25 Nov 1905.
106. Edin Sen 31 Jan 1905.
107. *Scotsman* 29 Mar 1905.
108. *School World* Jan 1906.
109. *Quarterly Review* Jan 1879.
110. Stocks (1986) quoting a letter from Craik to Lord Balfour of Burleigh (24 Jul 1901) ED 7/2/4 (SRO).
111. *Aberdeen University Review* Jun 1917 finds Craik talking of the "magic power" of the teacher and expressing his lack of faith in

codes, committees and commissions.

112. *School World* Jan 1906.
113. Letter from Struthers to the Aberdeen Committee 23 Jul 1907 ED 7 2/7 (SRO).
114. Scotland (1975).
115. Davie (1985) discussed earlier in the chapter.
116. Aber Sen 26 Jan 1904.
117. Aber Sen 1 Dec 1904.
118. Note by Struthers on a letter of Sellars 20 May 1904, cited by Scotland.
119. A movement linked perhaps to the wish of Struthers, noted by Davie (1985), to influence the new university curriculum also.
120. SED Report 1911-12.
121. Letter in Donaldson papers (Univ of St A) cited by Stocks (1968).
122. Edin Sen 15 Oct 1904.
123. Edin Sen 4 Mar 1905.
124. C C Report 1906-07. Report on Teacher Training.
125. *Ibid.*
126. *Educational News* Jan 1909.
127. *School World* Feb 1909.
128. Findlay (1979) p 103.
129. Tropp (1957) pp 194 & 243.
130. *Ibid.* p 86.
131. *School World* Jan 1911.
132. *School World* Aug 1911. There is some evidence that SED happily accepted the shortfall knowing that trained secondary teachers could be imported from England at no cost to themselves. Judd (1914) p 52.
133. Smith (1913) p 155.
134. *Teachers Guild Quarterly* 15 Mar 1906.
135. *School World* Mar 1915. "They cannot," he said, "expend a single shilling or make the smallest appointment without first having obtained the permission of the department".

136. *School World* Sep 1915.
137. Findlay (1979) p 175.
138. Cruickshank (1970) p 159.
139. *Ibid.* p 157.
140. *Ibid.* p 158.
141. ED 51/8/102 (SRO). Dundee was always a disappointment – to the University as much as to the SED. Despite the city's size, its Arts Faculty between 1900 and 1910 never attracted more than 30 men compared with St. Andrews high point of 155. Anderson (1983) pp 355–6.
142. *School World* Oct 1910.
143. *School World* Feb 1911.
144. *Educational News* 10 Mar 1911.
145. Linked to provisions of the new 1908 Arts curriculum which made concurrent work more difficult.
146. In 1919, the *Journal of Education* (Dec) noted that *all* college students went to the university for Education and English classes and, later, the interchange was probably even greater.
147. The SED claimed (SED Report for 1912–13 p 44) that the most potent cause of a growing drift away from the hopes of a closer university/college union was the growing popularity of the graduates' course as opposed to concurrent training. In students' minds, therefore, it was claimed, their university career and their college career became more and more separated. On the other hand, this claim may simply have been part of a public relations exercise.
148. Boyd *Autob* p 416.
149. McClelland Evidence ED 8/52/T98 (SRO).
150. *Scottish Education Journal* 5 Dec 1919.
151. Findlay (1979) p 177.

CHAPTER 5 ESTABLISHING THE DEGREE

"Neither in the Universities nor in the Training Colleges are there to be found Departments of Educational Research in any way comparable to those in England, Germany and the United States ... it is a serious outlook for our national education if we are always to live a parasitical educational life, dependent upon the research and investigations of others"

Duncan MacGillivray, Headmaster of Hillhead High School and President of the EIS in 1919¹

The collapse of all hope that the Provincial Committee system would give the Scottish universities a role in teacher-training such as was now being given to their English and American counterparts, did not mean, however, that the two Professors and the three Lecturers in Education found themselves with no work to do. Education (TP) continued to be a graduating subject, attracting sizeable classes² and, while the old diplomas were no longer acceptable to SED as a qualification for teaching in the state sector and the end of the old Local Committees had brought an end to the university training of students in local schools, the Education classes still proved attractive not merely to future teachers in the Scottish state sector but also to those intending to enter the Scottish private sector or English secondary schools, where no certificated training was necessary. Edinburgh, indeed, fearing the introduction of compulsion there had made strenuous efforts to get her Diploma recognised by the English authorities. In 1905 they agreed, temporarily, to recognise the Secondary School Practical Course and sent an inspector to Edinburgh, agreeing that it had been established "under good auspices" but suggesting that the University's "resources were as yet limited". The Senate replied that in the immediate future, they hoped to "increase the efficiency of this department of their work",³ echoing the words of Glasgow when setting up their own Local Committee.

Such weaknesses undoubtedly strengthened that part of Struthers' case in which he claimed that the renovated Colleges could provide a more widely based training

more in line with modern needs and no doubt weakened the attempts of the universities to keep secondary training in their own hands as the English universities had done. Viewed against such a background the distancing of the Colleges from the Universities and the lavishness of Struthers' spending on buildings and equipment are easier to understand.

Even so, despite their disappointed hopes for the Provincial Committees, there were reasons for the University Education Departments (as they were beginning to be known, now that assistants had become a normal feature of their operations) to envisage more than simply a poverty-stricken future of "hanging on". Of the three major movements that had helped to produce the 1905 Minute and its consequences, two were still far from fulfilled. Certainly the movement to provide universal secondary training had achieved most of its initial objectives and the element of compulsion was now being cautiously introduced in Scotland. On the other hand the movement to establish Faculties of Education which the EIS had now advocated in numerous Congresses, General Councils and deputations for over sixty years had still a long way to go while the movement to develop Scottish scientific activity in the field of Education similar to that in the USA, France and Germany saw much promise in elements of the lavish new building programme which the Provincial Committees were being allowed to mount even if this was offset by the as yet non-experimental policies and attitudes of SED itself. These two movements were now to come together in a series of events that eventually fixed the major role of the University Education Departments for over half a century.

Neither of the two movements was ever monolithic. The Faculty movement, having temporarily abandoned hope of persuading SED to vest all teacher-training powers in the Universities now fixed on the further notion of a Professional Degree for Teachers. A degree was, as yet, something that only a university could confer and its widespread development might well lead to the eventual establishment of Faculties and even to a revival of proposals for the incorporation of the Colleges into the

Universities on the Columbia model. At the same time there was no agreement, even among colleagues, on the level or form of such an award. Some favoured an exalted higher degree on a level with the DLitt or the LLD, to be awarded only to distinguished members of a profession which, it was constantly complained, was continually passed over in the public Honours Lists and at least one American visitor supported that viewpoint, given that the modern "short" PhD was still totally absent from Scottish academic life.⁴ Others envisaged a middle level professional degree analogous to the LLB or MB⁵ or a middle level research degree similar to the new Welsh American-style MA by Research. Perhaps the biggest group of all, led by Boyd and Darroch, envisaged a general degree for *all* teachers, based on G, TP and t, taken either as an alternative to the MA or to be awarded in addition to the MA at the undergraduate level. This was a quite realistic vision. The SED had never made any serious attempt to wrest G from the universities and, indeed, must have known that the university link had increasingly acted as a recruiting agent for a much higher standard of candidate, some even claimed, of a higher standard than law and medicine⁶ and though t might inevitably remain the prerogative of the College, who could forecast what might happen to the college sector itself once such a high quality degree had become popular?

As for the advocates of foreign ideas, they ranged from the advocates of free-play kindergartens and the philosophies of Dewey and Montessori through the advocates of German-style "experimental education", the efficiency movement and behaviourism to the quantifying followers of Thorndike and the French developers of Mental Testing.

Certainly, the Scottish profession was kept well informed about such developments. Every educational journal included a section on overseas events. The most influential, *Educational News*, the journal of the EIS itself, reported on events throughout Europe as well as giving detailed accounts of the meetings even of obscure American school boards such as that in Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.⁷ There was no absence of stimulus, while the attractions to Scottish students of

undertaking continental studies in the long vacation, which at the beginning of the century stretched from March to October led to increasing attendance at the most significant German centres of educational and psychological studies such as Jena, where short-term PhDs could be worked at during the summer months. Indeed, according to Simpson, the Scottish universities themselves were even becoming known to Americans as suitable staging posts in the planning of continental research trips. A writer in the *New York Educational Review* pointed out that the fees in Scotland were more moderate than at Oxford and Cambridge, that non-resident women were admitted, that there was "less supervision and more self-reliant" individual work and that it took only one and a half days from Leith to Hamburg by ship".⁸ Thus not just the influence and example but even the presence of serious American students were to affect Scottish attitudes from the beginning of the century onwards.

The situation was complex and it is now difficult to measure exactly how far German influences in particular reached Scotland (or Britain) directly and how far via North America where German works were often translated into English for the first time. One writer, for example, spoke of "these things [being] made in Germany, translated in America and misunderstood in Great Britain"⁹ though Armytage claims that Herbart, perhaps the most influential German in the first years of the century, was translated in Saxony by a British businessman.¹⁰ Certainly research and travel funds were more readily available for American students but influential Scots, such as Rusk, Drever and Adams all had direct German experience themselves and between 1900 and 1914, both American and German ideas were received with especial enthusiasm in Scotland. Even after the outbreak of war, Boyd¹¹ and other Scottish educationists were courageous enough to publish articles in defence of German educational ideas at a time when prejudice was rife in Scottish universities¹² and when academics with names of German origin, even if their links with the country were remote, found their livelihood in jeopardy.¹³

A key figure in Scotland was Rusk, who in 1912, published the first major British work on recent German developments, *Experimental Education*. As a "concurrent" student at the Glasgow Free Church Centre, he had completed his MA in 1903 followed by his Jena PhD in 1906, but on then going to Cambridge he had, in the fashion of the time, to become an undergraduate again, taking his BA in 1910.¹⁴ Even so he became something of a figure in the pioneering of Psychology there and claimed to have taught the young Bartlett in order to eke out his finances.¹⁵ His German experience had an abiding influence upon him and it was not until he arrived in Dundee as a lecturer at the new College that he made his first contact with Americans. Even so, Rusk always insisted that much of the outside world, and not merely Germany, was ahead of the United Kingdom in the new approaches to education. He certainly drew attention¹⁶ to the well-known developments in Germany and America but also to work in Russia, Belgium, Hungary, Italy, France, Switzerland, Austria and even Japan that was of a far higher scientific standard than that so far achieved by what to him were such hopelessly amateur organisations as the British Child Study movement.¹⁷

At the same time Rusk's was certainly not the first book that had revealed to Scots the importance of current continental models of methodological debate and experimental procedure. Boyd¹⁸ has since emphasised the earlier influence of Meumann and especially the translation of Clapereau in 1905 and, of course, German names had figured prominently in the campaign for the establishment of the Chairs during the nineteenth century while Donaldson, in his famous 1879 eulogy of German developments¹⁹ had drawn attention even then to a new school of Psychologists that had "deemed (education) a special portion of their department" and had "given us a thoroughly scientific exposition of the whole subject" and a series of translations of such work, some by Scots, kept German education in the Scottish eye.²⁰ With typical foresight Donaldson cited in particular the key figure of Herbart (according to Findlay, a writer largely unknown in England until the 1890s) who was to act as at worst a

catalyst and at best a positive influence on developments in the English speaking world. Through the works of enthusiasts such as Dodd (1901) his views exercised a "remarkable influence" in England, from the mid-1890s onward²¹ though Darroch and others came to be critical of what they could only call "this Herbartian cult", whose devotees "had been concerned mainly with the explanation and development of the theories of their master"²² and were now accused, like later Marxists, of being prisoners of their master's world view. The "cult" was never widespread in Scotland. Even so Herbart was widely discussed and quoted in educational circles and, before he retired, Laurie (not necessarily with Herbart's interests in mind) persuaded the Edinburgh Senate to hire Darroch (not yet in their employ) to give a series of public lectures on him.²³ According to Findlay, all this "came as a kind of revelation" to educationists in England and the United States and Herbart's most permanent beneficial effect was to bring to an end the general British acceptance of the old Faculty psychology while his most baleful was to impose on teacher-training a somewhat neoclassical pro-forma device for the planning and marking of practice lessons - the so-called "five steps". Such was the air of religiosity that eventually surrounded the whole topic that, in biblical scholarship tradition, a later Scottish Professor of Education was even to draw attention to the obscurity surrounding the facts of the great hero's life.²⁴

Findlay, whose appointment as the first Manchester professor in 1899 coincided with the height of the movement, saw the Herbartians as those who for the first time wanted to link the high level theoretical study of education to scientifically sound practical studies and to guide Education Professors out of the world of Philosophy and Theology into the world of Psychology and there is no doubt that this did much to establish his appeal in America where for some decades and with German models constantly before them, the universities had been gradually changing their function. At Ann Arbor, for example, the new University of Michigan was said to have abandoned the style of "petty colleges obedient to deteriorated traditions of English

methods" and "developed training ... ideals and methods largely from Germany"²⁵ and from the 1860s onwards, the growth of graduate schools began to make advanced work a pre-requisite for promotion and tenure.²⁶

Students of Education were not to remain immune. They, like other American academics, could no longer "leave life to chance, miscellanea, floating categories or fleeting impressions. They filled structured space with structured thoughts and words".²⁷ In a remarkable way that has never been fully explained, a whole new world of educational studies grew up, comprehending in a wave of general excitement elements that, by modern stereotyping, would be mutually contradictory. Thus an extreme child-centred pedagogy with Rousseau as its hero was developed alongside objective, behaviourist experimentation, mental testing and the cult of administrative efficiency, the one great link between the disparate strands being a belief in the professional pride and development of the teacher. Moreover, this movement was not merely educational in the narrowest sense of pertaining to schooling but something deeply influencing the whole of modern American culture. Moreover, Bailyn discerns in what he calls these "founders and early evangelists of professionalism in America ... a conviction that the study of education was not merely, in our more narrowly academic sense, a discipline but something grander than that, more esoteric and more important (and) its methods should be *scientific*".²⁸ This was the dominant theme, he suggested, of writers of influential books and of many articles published at the turn of the century in new and (strange as it may now seem) "exciting" periodicals such as Nicholas Murray Butler's *Educational Review*, G.Stanley Hall's *Pedagogical Seminary* and the University of Chicago's *School Review*, all demonstrating that education could build up "a solid body of scientific knowledge and universally accepted principles." At one end of a single spectrum was Colonel Parker of Chicago with his child-centred enthusiasms gathered in Europe, and at the other the rigidly objective Psychologist Thorndike with his reminder that "whatever exists, exists in some amount", and therefore can be measured,²⁹ a maxim adapted from Ebbinghaus and his German

fellow Psychologists.

Yet, of particular significance outside the United States and in some ways, the antithesis of Thorndike was the group of Pragmatists surrounding John Dewey, who, in Darroch's words, denied that "truth or knowledge is ... something fixed and eternal which, once discovered is for ever valid".³⁰ "Fixed" scientific truth, they felt, was the enemy of professionals. Knowledge, they believed, arose in order to better practice – the aim of every educationist and especially of those engaged in teacher training; it was relative to the needs and necessities of man and not something which had an existence independent of those needs. Hence their emphasis on societal needs and their attraction for Darroch, Selleck seeing him as one of Dewey's chief British disciples.³¹

However, Dewey was influential in the psychological world also and Drever another of Laurie's students³² and the first Professor of Psychology in Edinburgh, was to make clear that Dewey's commitment underlay his own commitment to the popularisation and using of ideas (i.e. serving society) as well as to scientific experiment, just as it underlay the development of the American School Psychological service, which made Boyd think with shame of the inadequacies of Scottish arrangements³³ and linked the "open" philosophy of Dewey to the subsequently "closed" world of allocatory mental testing. Rugg, indeed, believes that any account of Dewey must take into account "all the sciences and arts of man" and that he cannot be discussed in isolation from "other great contemporaries on the other great frontiers of thought and action in the early 1900s" – in the theatre, in art, in the physical sciences. Before World War I, he claimed, "aside from Dewey, there was no scientific theory-building (beyond the Herbartians' improving of formal methodology) ... All one could do if he (sic) had enthusiasm for education was to improvise largely out his own head."³⁴

It is, of course, difficult to reconcile this image of Dewey as scientific liberator with the often narrow objectivity of some of Thorndike's followers who, Rugg claims,

"despite an orgy of question-blanking ... and tabulating everything observable in schools" did almost everything without benefit of theory.³⁵ No wonder, therefore, there was some resistance to American ideas from those in Europe who sought intellectual integrity and suspected shallowness and for the remainder of the century they were to remain under initial suspicion from those who sought a wholeness of intellectual approach,³⁶ for this American movement, if it can be called a movement, embraced a whole spectrum of scientific attitudes. Some of its adherents were theoreticians with little to show in the way of hard evidence, others were assiduous collectors of evidence with very little theory, a heterogeneous collection of enthusiasts united only by its desire to enhance both education as an activity and the status of its practitioners. Thus Thorndike could write one of the eulogies, so common at the time, in honour of Stanley Hall, as a great prophet of the movement, and yet could not resist adding the rider that such a polymath, with 439 published items to his name, many of them in Psychology, was nevertheless in his opinion a literary man rather than a man of science and went on to quote another contemporary who said he would place Hall "as a scientist, in a rank below zero".³⁷

Even so, despite Education becoming an increasingly scientific field, such polymaths were for the moment highly successful. Cubberley, a Professor at Stanford, initially studied school administration but later he sat also at the feet of the Columbia Herbartians as well as at those of Thorndike and the sociologist Giddings.³⁸ Moreover, he took seriously studies not merely in Education, but in Political Science, a subject also taken at the post-graduate stage with honours by both Darroch and Drever³⁹ in what was clearly a current Anglo-American fashion. The personal education of the new educators, indeed, exemplifies the belief, Selleck suggests that they held about child education – that individuality grew best in an atmosphere of freedom and new departures.⁴⁰

This certainly appears to have been the case in Teachers' College, Columbia, so admired by Haldane and most Scots educationists, where Cubberley had pursued his

varied curriculum and where, according to Rugg, more than half of the men who revolutionised American teacher education worked, "the product of a special culture and outlook on life and of a theory of education based upon it".⁴¹ There they managed to integrate not only the various contributing disciplines but also scholarship and the teacher's professional training in a way that had so far eluded the Scottish centres and, indeed a number of distinguished American centres also.

At Harvard for example, there had been a determination to distance a serious University School of Education from the Normal Schools but as a result there had developed a somewhat doctrinaire commitment to educational professionalism of a rather idiosyncratic kind. The result was an alienation of the School both from the general body of teachers and from the rest of the University.⁴² In Columbia and Chicago this was avoided and an apparently workable synthesis achieved.

It was the success of these two centres that exerted such an influence on Scottish thinking which all too often uncritically idealised American developments and ignored the doubts often expressed by Americans themselves – doubts, for example, about the imprecise nature of so much of the theory and scientific reporting. Scots turned to the United States not for scepticism but for spiritual and professional refreshment as the *Glasgow University Magazine*, for example, made clear in its obituary on Miss Galloway of Queen Margaret's College, which emphasised how dependent she had become for inspiration on her visits to America.⁴³

Between 1895 and 1945 a handful of American education professors became "several thousand". "Most of these were recruited from the public schools and only a negligible percentage had a mastery of the basic foundations in the sciences or the arts. Yet any European disillusionment lay in the future. Their dynamic professors were, for the moment a spur to their British admirers. "Why is it?" asked Ballard, for example, in 1920, "that America has been moving so rapidly in the matter of mental tests while England has almost stood still? ... The answer is simple ... Americans

believe in Psychology but Englishmen do not ..."⁴⁴ The language was clearly that of faith as much of scientific conviction.

Some American visitors to Europe were embarrassed by this over-adulation and were all too conscious of how superficial, head-counting surveys, for example, had all too often replaced the far more complex and difficult classroom experiments of the European pioneers as the prime activity of their Educational Science, while the American development of secondary school training now actually lagged behind that of Western Europe generally.⁴⁵

Even so, the American influence continued and German-American models of educational research in the style of Wundt, Thorndike and Catell were to be adopted on a major scale. In Britain things were to move somewhat slowly though Scotland did take a rather cautious lead and in England it was often expatriate Scots like Adams who set the pace, as Bain and Laurie had done before him, though he was careful to issue a continual warning against spurious innovations and to enunciate a persuasive and cautionary theory of cyclical recurrence in relation to curriculum change.⁴⁶ Even the Child Study Movement, generally regarded as the earliest American-style research activity in Britain,⁴⁷ had actually been launched in Edinburgh (at a meeting in 1893) though as Rusk rightly points out, it is difficult to discern the real origins of the British scientific movement in education.⁴⁸ The visits of ladies from Cheltenham and St. George's to Chicago were certainly related to the origins of "scientific" child study but such visits by the British to American universities had become progressively more frequent during the 1880s and 90s, while American visits to Europe were even more frequent during the same decades with Stanley Hall in particular making many contacts in England and Scotland. Patrick Geddes, for example, involved him in his Edinburgh Outlook Tower scheme,⁴⁹ though the scale of such exchanges must not be exaggerated. Colonel Parker of Chicago made an extensive tour of Europe without visiting Britain at all⁵⁰ and contacts were perhaps never as great as some have assumed. Not all those educationalists who spoke with

enthusiasm of America had met an actual American.

Even so the pressure for the development of psychological research in particular continued to grow in England as in Scotland under pressure from the British Association, for example, and from Roscoe and the advocates of Teacher Registration.⁵¹ Symptomatically, the Teachers Guild, whose main concern was with teacher registration, established a Research Committee of their own⁵² with a distinctly psychological flavour and similar in scope to the one subsequently established by Boyd and the EIS. Roscoe spoke specifically of the desirability of the growth of research within the University Departments of Education and Psychology and the growing influence of Psychologists was to have a bracing effect on British educational thinking in general. In both England and Scotland, the pioneers took heart from the fact that for the first few decades American developments had been on a very small scale and they might also have taken heart from the fact, McClelland suggests, that in the early days, it had even proved difficulty to launch research in the German universities also.⁵³

Symptomatically, the *Training College Record*, the organ of the Association of Teachers in Colleges of Education, became in 1911 the *Journal of Experimental Pedagogy* (to be swallowed up later in the *British Journal of Educational Psychology*) and although it occasionally, like the *BJEP* itself, would sometimes slip back into old-fashioned literary history and uncritical adulation of leading figures, Spearman saw the first change of title as of considerable significance. "This re-baptism may be taken as an outward sign of specialised re-birth" and that certainly with regard to mental testing "Energetic activity is developing all over the country to make amends for past dilatoriness".⁵⁴

Even so, British academic research in general and not merely in Education remained grossly underdeveloped. A.J. Balfour, in a private letter to Carnegie, welcoming a further grant to the Scottish universities, expressed himself "amazed and

almost ashamed at the indifference with which the British public has acquiesced in the wholly inadequate provision which we make for scientific training and research and this not merely in the Scotch universities but at Oxford, Cambridge and other great historic places of learning".⁵⁵ He saw universities "not merely as places where the best kind of knowledge already attained is imparted, but as places where the stock of the world's scientific knowledge may be augmented." Yet, as Simpson notes, the number of graduate students in Britain (in 1983 some 13% of the student body) formed a mere 6% by 1938 and in 1913 was only "a handful,"⁵⁶ whereas the Germans had already awarded hundreds of PhDs since the beginning of the nineteenth century (many of them to Scots and other foreigners) and the Americans had been catching up rapidly since the 1860s. "Quantity production" of educational research which America had achieved by the 1920s⁵⁷ was not achieved in Britain until the 1960s at the earliest.

What British research did make progress, however, tended to be in the field of Psychology and its overlapping fields of "experimental education" and mental testing. In Scotland the distinction between the three was blurred from the beginning and continued to be blurred even when the universities began officially to cover them in separate courses or even in separate departments.⁵⁸ As Psychology moved out of the speculative fields of Philosophy into physiology and then into experimentation it was more and more seen as the indispensable partner of the new educational approaches. The inevitability of such a development was already accepted even in Laurie's earliest lectures and some of the opposition to the chair had sprung from the possibly anti-religious implications of an increasingly "physiological" orientation of the science of pedagogy. Oren actually sees the establishment of Laurie's chair as a contribution to the growth of Psychology in Britain and believes that the infant school movement was a major influence in cementing the partnership.⁵⁹

Certainly one of the mainsprings of the American research movement was the development of Experimental Psychology. For Rugg it was "the immediate impetus for

the new educational research"⁶⁰ and Findlay saw such a phenomenon as a natural development from Philosophy at a time when people were lamenting the gap between theory and practice, as natural as Aristotle and Plato's transfer of their attention from Metaphysics to the laws of Economics, Law and Politics.⁶¹ Thus "educational" psychology in America soon went beyond the theories of learning and classroom interaction to questions of administrative efficiency. As early as 1912 even an English writer could begin to discuss psychological theory in relation to the appointment of inspectors⁶² and in one of the first of its annual reports after the first war, the SED noted that the public interest in Psychology continued unabated.⁶³ By then many things had now become possible. Findlay, introducing the 1919 edition of Terman's "Measurement of Intelligence" claimed that if "five years ago it had been proposed to issue an English edition of the book now before us, the proposal would have been rejected as impractical".⁶⁴ It was during those five years that the Scottish education degrees were finally established and they were to provide a firm base for the future development of a Scottish scientific movement and research machinery - degrees in which Education and Psychology were, therefore, inevitably to be partners.

In the autumn of 1913 a paper at the British Association meeting in Birmingham had suggested that a board for the encouragement of educational experiments should be set up in each big centre of population, consisting not merely of teachers but also of local professors of Psychology and Education⁶⁵ and the notion of such a partnership seems to have been largely unchallenged in the negotiations leading to the Scottish degree's foundation. One Glasgow supporter of the Faculty of Education idea, Professor Reid, was at pains to dissociate it from the cause of Experimental Psychology⁶⁶ and figures such as the English Education Professor Bumpas Smith also attacked "the fashionable concentration on Psychology (which) should not be allowed to observe the relevance of the social environment to education"⁶⁷ but the cause of Sociology as a further partner received few backers. As early as 1905 Donaldson pointed out that many a Historian talked Sociology, like M. Jourdain talked prose,

without knowing it⁶⁸ but attempts to establish the subject in the Divinity Faculty of Edinburgh in 1901⁶⁹ and in the United College at St. Andrews in 1912⁷⁰ got nowhere. Indeed in 1907, the Edinburgh Court had declared the appointment of a Lecturer in that subject to be "not desirable"⁷¹ and Sociologists had to wait half a century for a chance, formally, to be involved in Educational Studies in the Scottish universities.⁷²

In 1914 the *Secondary School Journal* mildly attacked the appointment of the "specialist" Psychologist Valentine to the chair of Education in Belfast⁷³ and the more sophisticated American centres such as Chicago were, as early as 1909, already abandoning Psychology as a separate course in favour of integrated courses for teachers;⁷⁴ but in underdeveloped Britain the pioneering of the new science still demanded separate treatment. Just as Adams rejoiced in the fact that teachers had "captured" Psychology, he could also point out that "had it not been for the demands of the teachers, chairs in this subject would not have been so common in our universities and progress in it would have been much less rapid".⁷⁵

At the beginning of the century, despite Hearnshaw's claim that "Scotland ... was more friendly to Psychology than England"⁷⁶ the teaching of the subject was still relatively unadventurous at least as far as Education was concerned⁷⁷ with cautious figures such as Sully dominating the syllabus.⁷⁸ Some enthusiasts for Educational Studies were still dubious about German-American developments and even Donaldson had his doubts about Experimental Psychology, though he admitted that it might be essential that it should go into the St. Andrews programme.⁷⁹ Even so, the study of the subject had been given a considerable boost by its inclusion in the SED's compulsory programme for training courses following the 1905 Minute and the amount of teaching it required stimulated a general creation of posts⁸⁰ and in Edinburgh, thanks to the Combe Trustees, it led to the founding in 1906 of the first Scottish University Lectureship in the subject to be independent of Logic and Metaphysics.⁸¹ Even in Aberdeen where Bain had led the development of philosophical approaches to psychology⁸² and where, a Lectureship in Comparative Psychology had

been set up as early as 1896,⁸³ the subject could only be taken as a second course after Logic and in stipulating that the new Edinburgh Lectureship should be independent, the Trustees had also insisted that the Combe Lecturer "should make provision for the teaching of Applied Psychology particularly as regards the application of Psychology to Education".⁸⁴

In this particular field, the SED was well disposed towards the universities, seeking there both manpower and expertise. Moreover they were uncommonly generous to the Provincial Committees in the equipping of laboratories in the training centres,⁸⁵ especially at Edinburgh, and were even willing to finance trips abroad that, in the case of Drever, were to prove particularly influential.⁸⁶

Drever was also a leading advocate of the creation of Scottish Teachers Colleges on the Columbia model.⁸⁷ For him such a College would possess "all the essential features of the English Day Training Departments and the Scottish Provincial Training Centres" but would also provide "for ordinary and higher degrees and for research in Education in the full measure and spirit of a university", a view shared by much of the Scottish educational press and the inspectorate who were later to welcome Godfrey Thomson to the Edinburgh Chair partly because of his American connections.⁸⁸

Under Drever, much influenced by Rusk,⁸⁹ and by his predecessor Smith, the "new" Psychology was thus firmly established from 1905 onwards in a well equipped laboratory comparable to those in Cambridge and University College, London⁹⁰ and owing as much to American as to German examples. Even so, as we have seen, some aspects of the American movement were no more welcomed in Scotland than elsewhere in Britain. It was felt, for example, that the American PhD programme had often developed examination techniques that were profoundly anti-educational⁹¹ and unlike many contemporary Americans, Scottish writers such as Boyd, Rusk and Drever were always careful to avoid unnecessary jargon even when discussing research technicalities. All three saw themselves not so much as popularisers as interpreters

of recent developments to the teaching profession and parents and the impressing of their academic peers was increasingly of less importance to them.⁹² Drever's *Psychology of Everyday Life*⁹³ he said, was "not an elementary textbook ... nor a popular account of some of the marvels of psychology with all the psychology left out", nevertheless it appeared without either index or references as did his *Psychology of the Pre-School Child* appearing as late as 1929. Similarly Rusk concentrated on producing work for a general audience, rather than producing the, literally, hundreds of academic papers produced even by American polymaths such as Stanley Hall.⁹⁴

All three had a strong historical/philosophical background, which they did not neglect even after turning their attention to matters of Psychology and testing. Boyd was to combine the running of the EIS Research Committee and the founding of his Clinic with the authorship of a History of Western Education and a general book on Rousseau that are both still in print,⁹⁵ while Rusk's pioneering of Experimental Education and his subsequent leadership of the Scottish Council for Research never prevented him from constantly revising textbooks on the history of ideas that still sell widely in Britain and America some sixty years after their first publication.⁹⁶ An early Scottish reviewer of *Experimental Education* noted how it combined a scientific approach with "real human feeling"⁹⁷ and an observer of a later period noted how his belief that Thomson's *Moray House Tests* were becoming inhuman in their use could reduce Rusk to tears even at public meetings.⁹⁸ Drever came to his Lectureship in Psychology from one in Comparative Education and he was also the author of a best-selling book on ancient Greek Education,⁹⁹ while Darroch was not only widely accepted as a Philosopher but also gave his energies to developing the Edinburgh course in mental testing, lecturing throughout Scotland on the values of developing Psychology,¹⁰⁰ and acting as midwife to the Moray House laboratory.

Such a polymath approach was a normal characteristic of all the early Scottish university educationists and was naturally reflected in the structure of the eventual degrees which were firmly generalist in the Scottish tradition and did not even allow

the range of options already available even in the Scottish Ordinary degree programme. One man's polymath is, of course, another man's dilettante and Boyd, in particular, was to earn the scorn of later specialists.¹⁰¹ Indeed some early associates of the Scottish movement appeared later to distance themselves from it. Valentine, for example, seems to have removed all reference to his earlier Scottish period at St. Andrews in later editions of his standard book.¹⁰² Even so, such figures fit easily into an earlier Scottish tradition described by Davie, who noted that "whereas for Priestley, the path of educational progress lay in promoting experiments in language reform, teaching machines, new ways of external conditioning, the pedagogical programme of Scotland's thinkers was a much more centralised and intellectual affair, consisting in the production of authorised textbooks of a remarkable originality and power, aimed at the very necessary and difficult task of properly elucidating the technical language of the sciences in terms of the distinctiveness of everyday speech".¹⁰³

It was for very similar reasons that the Scottish Education degrees were founded, to communicate the old historical/philosophical and the new American/German experimental ideas to the intellectually most aware and/or the most ambitious of Scottish teachers. The new American inspiration cannot be doubted and is continually mentioned in resolutions and memoranda as well as university debates during the period of the degree's creation¹⁰⁴ but there is always the unwritten assumption that the traditional syllabus of the existing MA courses will also be developed and carried to a higher level - and that the new Psychology and the older Educational tradition of Laurie and Meiklejohn will be equal partners in the enterprise. For Rusk, what was evolving was a new Science of Education rather than a simple applying of Psychology to educational questions, "a new movement which will doubtless take rank in the history of Education beside the efforts of Comenius". "The time is past," he claimed, when to "apply"¹⁰⁵ the principles of adult psychology might be thought a sufficient basis for a science of education and in that belief he had the support of the English psychologist Burt for one.¹⁰⁶

The impulse to the degree lay, as we have said, primarily in the perennial campaign of the EIS for a Faculty, a campaign now considerably strengthened by recent academic developments in the field. In 1906, the President of the Glasgow Teachers Guild called on the universities to "come readily into line with the new movement ... and by gradually securing the institution of a fully organised and degree-granting Faculty of Education, help to raise the teacher's high calling to its proper academic".¹⁰⁷ The call for research in particular began to come even from those who tended to be sceptical about any possible university input to the training of teachers. Scougal, for example, when still an inspector in the West, was calling as early as 1901 for an end to "the days of empirical teaching, trial by error and muddling through", and declared that research would be taken up with enthusiasm "by the majority of schools".¹⁰⁸ But the professional associations wanted the base for such reforms clearly housed in the universities. In the 1905 Blue Book, the Inspector of Training notes how Edgar had found a disposition towards "extended study of a special character in line with students' professional interests and requirements"¹⁰⁹ and the EIS and Secondary Teachers Association in the years that followed passed numerous resolutions calling now not merely for a Faculty but specifically for a professional degree in education because, said Malloch, "public opinion will never accord professional status to any calling that does not by its own workers produce systematically new discoveries that may lead to further progress". Moreover he believed that such a research degree would help to offset the increasingly heterogeneous nature of recruits to the profession.¹¹⁰

Such a degree, as we noted earlier, could take a number of forms, not all of them linked to research or even the needs of the "movement".

A. It could be at the level of doctorate in line with the Scottish five year post-graduate doctorates instituted, ostensibly to encourage research, during the 1890s

B. It could simply be a development of the Ordinary MA course by the provision of courses at Honours level in Education and/or Psychology

C. It could take the form of a totally new undergraduate degree, possibly at both Ordinary and Honours level, designed specifically for the needs of future teachers

or D. a totally new post-graduate degree for teachers, an idea canvassed by the Training of Secondary Teachers Joint Committee as far back as 1897.¹¹¹ But such a post-graduate degree could also take many forms. Some saw this merely as an Honours degree postponed until after graduation in order to enable teachers to complete a first Honours degree in a school subject area. Others saw it as a purely research degree. A growing number, however, saw it as a combination of both and in a *Secondary School Journal* article¹¹² McGillivray, a Glasgow headmaster, drew attention to some American courses that appeared to include both elements.

It is of course, easy, because of the large number of official statements and discussions, to exaggerate the strength of teacher enthusiasm for such a degree of any kind. The minutes of the Glasgow University Pedagogical Society record a "very interesting paper on a Degree in Education by Mr John Logie MA BSc" in November 1913, at the height of the campaign but notes that "attendance was not so large as usual".¹¹³ Even so, the Blue Book for 1912-13 felt it necessary to acknowledge the existence of "a movement which has gathered strength" and to summarise some of the rival proposals, though it "proposed to offer no opinion on the various schemes" although the question was "one which the Department cannot view with indifference".¹¹⁴ If anything SED welcomed the initiative. "The endowment of Educational Science is indeed an object for which the Scottish Universities may well take counsel together. American University programmes display an elaborate organisation of educational studies with which at present we have nothing to compare ...". Significantly for the future, the Inspector spoke of these American models as things "we can scarcely hope to rival in Scotland except by combining all our forces"

- including, presumably, the Universities and the SED-controlled Provincial Committees' Colleges.

As regards the choices of degree forms, opinion in the universities themselves was naturally divided. To many Senate members, A was undoubtedly very attractive. In all four universities there already existed a set of Doctors' degrees that could be easily modified to meet the needs of Education.¹¹⁵ Moreover, the taking of such an exalted degree would be so demanding both academically and financially that it would keep out all but the most committed and respectable students from universities increasingly nervous about the social damage being inflicted by the hordes of often uncouth teacher trainees thronging the Arts Faculties. Nor would it require either extra staff or accommodation. Typically, the educationally quietist Glasgow Senate favoured this solution, the one drawback of which was that it generated little if any extra income.

B was also attractive. It required no new Ordinance, it could probably be provided by existing staff with very little extra assistance while it appeared to be conferring honour on both the profession and the subject area at minimum cost and with least disturbance.¹¹⁶ As a skilled committee man, Darroch at first favoured such a solution, especially as it overcame university reluctance to support Honours classes in Education and Psychology.¹¹⁷ Darroch felt that such a solution could easily be made acceptable in Edinburgh.

C and D, on the other hand, promised far more upheavals. D was academically more acceptable, even if some professors might prove very sceptical about aspects of the American movement and even if it might require a considerable outlay on extra staffing, should the Provincial Committee not be able to supply the necessary specialists and equipment. But C was least popular of all. It might bring in extra numbers, especially if students could be transferred from the Colleges, but it would almost certainly be conducted and bring in students at the lowest of allowable

standards as well as interfering with full treatment of the school subject areas, while some of the detailed proposals under C suggested so great an expansion of staffing (including not just Assistants, but even Lecturers and Professors) that the financial prospects in themselves seemed horrendous.

The university Education and Psychology Departments themselves were also divided on the issue. Boyd of Glasgow while not necessarily disagreeing with Darroch over B, much preferred C and a Faculty totally geared to teachers' needs. Principal Donaldson, as early as 1904, was advocating something similar to B as part of a general reform of the Arts curriculum.¹¹⁸ Drever, however, immediately pressed for D and regretted Darroch's caution.¹¹⁹

The teachers' organisations, also, were soon united in favour of D. Neither A nor B was undesirable in itself. However, A would touch far too few people while B was hardly practicable given that any students capable of achieving Honours, would want to achieve it in a subject they could teach in a Secondary school. Moreover, Darroch and his followers talked only of an expanded MA so that it would not be open to Science students to top up their BSc in the same way. C, despite Boyd's idealism and devotion to the EIS, was attacked from the start by the EIS as an attempt to fob off what was an increasingly graduate profession with an education degree that might well lower their social status instead of raising it,¹²⁰ for such a degree was almost certain either to require too long a course or to necessitate the watering down of the main academic content. It would therefore inevitably be regarded as inferior even to the Ordinary MA degree-option. D, on the other hand, would not only have undoubted academic status because of the level at which it was pursued, but would also expand the Education Departments' activities in such a way that it brought a Faculty or Teachers' College nearer. Finally, especially if it were called a *Bachelor* of Education degree, it could be set alongside the traditional professional degrees of LLB and BD with the obvious and desirable consequences for the teachers' status.

At the Aberdeen Congress of the EIS in 1914, at a time when the possibilities of A and B were still being pressed, the president, McCallum attacked the notion of an undergraduate degree or of a mere Diploma – “giving a recognition by the University which would be inferior to the degrees conferred on other people – say for the study of the growth of trees or the growth of cattle.” This, he believed, was highly inappropriate for a university like Aberdeen where three-fifths or Glasgow where one half of Arts Faculty students intended to be teachers.¹²¹

However, although D was more widely favoured in the profession and eventually, after some years of struggle, did win the day, in the early stages B ran it close and it could be argued that what finally emerged was an amalgamation of the two – the new degree was in the end essentially an undergraduate level, taught honours degree (in many cases sharing courses with undergraduate students) but it was taken at the post-graduate level, and involved a minor piece of research, thus adding extra academic prestige and an air of modernity to it.

The profession made known its feelings on the issue most effectively through the Universities' General Councils, the general body of all graduates, in which teachers formed a major presence. Indeed their presence was strong enough to ensure the election of at least one teacher candidate to parliament (the franchise being based on General Council membership)¹²² and the St. Andrews Council was even willing to reorganise its meetings to suit the school timetable.¹²³ In themselves the Councils could do nothing however without the support of either the Principal, the Court or the Senate or various combinations of them, lacking the status to have their own, isolated requests taken seriously. As the Editor of the *Glasgow University Magazine* asserted in 1913 – “The less said of the General Council the better ... It cannot be said to know its own mind for the plain reason that it has no mind to know”. Even so, during the ensuing debates the General Councils did perhaps acquire something of a temporary importance and effectiveness that they were probably never to know either before or since, for certainly it was their steady insistence on the degree, and particularly on D,

that was the biggest single cause of eventual success.

Within the universities, while it rarely became a dominant issue, the question of the education degree formed part (often a major part) of the agenda at some 160 meetings of Courts, Senates and Councils between 1911 and 1919 while a special joint meeting of the four Courts at the Station Hotel, Perth in a crucial week of the war, on 2nd November 1918, called to discuss little more than the title of the Aberdeen degree attracted the attendance of no less than three of the four University Principals.

The cause of D had been given something of a fillip by the development of post-graduate research bachelorships at Oxford and Cambridge and the establishment of the first British Master's degree by research (in the American style) first in Wales and later in Manchester – though none of these universities had as yet attracted many students. There were also some official indications that classes for serving teachers (as opposed to future teachers) would be welcomed in what Andrew, the West of Scotland HMI (writing in the 1907 Report) described as "the necessary fundamental instruction in modern psychology and child study".¹²⁴ But it was in the East of Scotland that the processes within the universities began, there being a general belief at this time that what Edinburgh did the others would follow¹²⁵ and, as might have been expected, it was the General Council there that began them.

On October 27th 1911 a report of the Edinburgh G.C. Business Committee (written, one suspects, by Morgan, Principal of Moray House)¹²⁶ outlined the history of educational studies in the Scottish universities and specifically drew attention to recent advances in England, France, Germany and the USA with Columbia well to the fore. It drew attention to the fact that England had as yet no education degree but that the (Scottish) Secondary Education Association (with over 1500 members) and the EIS (with over 13,000) had both unanimously declared in favour of a policy necessarily implying the institution of such a degree in Scotland. The Edinburgh G.C. committee then specifically recommended a suitable curriculum which, significantly, "on the

analogy of the existing degrees of BD and LLB might be called BE" They claimed it would cost the university nothing and suggested that teaching could in part be provided in the local Training College on the same basis that some university courses were already being taught in Heriot-Watt College and the then independent College of Agriculture and Royal Dick Veterinary Institution.¹²⁷

At its next meeting the Council accepted this report by a large majority on the motion of Morgan, seconded by Laurie's son, the Principal of Heriot-Watt, but it did not reach the Court until the following May.¹²⁸ It was then passed to the Senate who referred it to the Faculty of Arts which was not enthusiastic and sent a stalling reply.¹²⁹ The Court, however, with a further Secondary Education Association motion on its table, insisted that the matter should be pursued and set up a joint Court-Senate Committee to explore it.¹³⁰ Such Court and General Council pressure in response to Senate reluctance was to be repeated elsewhere, most spectacularly in Glasgow. Senates seem both to have been more aware of the consequences of such a development for other departments and to have contained the highest proportion of those sceptical about Educational Studies in general, though Davie believes that some unexpected Senate enthusiasm for the degree may well have arisen from the opportunity it afforded to remove Education from the undergraduate programme and thus avoid the embarrassing threat it had posed for "traditional" philosophy.¹³¹

December 1912 saw a similar joint Court-Senate committee being proposed by the Court in St. Andrews,¹³² only to be rebuffed by the Senate so firmly that the matter was dropped for another three years – a sign of the weakness of the position both of Edgar as Professor and of the St. Andrews General Council, which could not even muster a delegation to a joint meeting of General Councils in Perth (in October 1915) called to discuss the matter.

In February 1913 the *Secondary School Journal* published a major editorial on the proposed degree, drawing attention to the American model and firmly supporting D to

which, they were glad to note, Darroch was now a convert. They attacked Boyd's continuing attachment to C - which to them was simply Laurie's old failed experiment with the Edinburgh Licentiate in Arts - "few of us who are entitled to use it would care to affix it to their name". What was required was "a degree ensuring a thorough study of all branches of educational philosophy and educational science ... comparable with the LLB and BD ... it is hardly likely that in the near future anyone will be appointed to high administrative posts such as Directorships or Secretaryships of Education or Inspectorships of Schools who cannot produce evidence (such as a University degree) of having made a scientific study of education".¹³³ It was already well-known that such studies were now being spoken of as prerequisites for American administrators.¹³⁴

Even in Edinburgh, however, things moved slowly. In the summer of 1913 the Provincial Committee put further pressure on the Court to take action¹³⁵ and the widespread campaign in the educational press continued. In October 1913 in a widely reported speech to the British Association in Birmingham, Kimmins, Chief Inspector to the LCC noted how the number of university students (in England) taking educational research for their thesis in higher exams "was increasing rapidly but was still in no way commensurate with the importance of this department of knowledge"¹³⁶ while a month later Morgan in a speech to the Secondary Education Association drew attention to how Scotland was lagging behind the psychological and pedagogical laboratories of the continent and the USA and called for urgent action. The Universities of Scotland, he maintained, had not yet taken their due share in this work.¹³⁷ But when the joint Court/Senate committee's report at last came to the Edinburgh Senate on December 12th it was, as a delaying tactic perhaps, sent this time for comment not merely to the Faculty of Arts but to all the Faculties.¹³⁸ Principal Turner himself had, a few days earlier, made clear his preference for B at the A.G.M. of the SEA and had sought refuge in the notion that any degree would only be possible if all four universities were unanimous on the issue but this had met with the

wrath of the meeting which passed a motion totally rejecting his views.¹³⁹

No doubt Darroch's earlier preference for an Honours MA may have contributed to the Edinburgh delay but in his address to the SEA Congress in St. Andrews some months earlier he already appeared to have made it clear that by that time only a post-graduate degree was being considered. According to Drever, Darroch had been reluctant to launch into the complex and (in the Senate) unpopular course of invoking the Ordinance procedure which would be required for D (involving as it did, not only internal discussion but reference to the three other universities and to the Privy Council) until he was convinced that there really was a need to do so.¹⁴¹ The Edinburgh plan that emerged (which was to become a prototype for the other three) envisaged a degree of two stages with a new Diploma being awarded at the end of the first stage. Drever claims that Darroch was tempted to halt, experimentally, at that first stage¹⁴² which required merely the consent of the Court and the Chancellor. At a meeting in late 1912 of a Provincial Committee sub-committee (with Darroch in the chair and Morgan in attendance) a memo had been drawn up "on the various methods by which an affiliation might be effected between the work of the Universities and the Training Colleges with the ultimate object in view of establishing a degree for students of Education".¹⁴³ This envisaged a preliminary stage of the degree to take place, normally, during the student's period of teacher-training. On 16 June 1913 this memo reached the Edinburgh Court who in turn handed it to a joint Senate and Court Committee which met on 14 October¹⁴⁴ and at the Court meeting on 17 November there seemed to be general agreement about the institution of the first stage i.e. the Diploma though the Teacher Associations continued to press their view that only a full degree would satisfy them.

Such pressure was being maintained in all four centres, especially at the end of 1913, by the SEA. In Glasgow University itself on December 3rd at a better attended meeting of the Pedagogical Society had further debated the issue of a teachers' degree with D emerging as the most favoured alternative¹⁴⁵ but the Glasgow Senate,

at its January meeting of 1914 was still unwilling to offer anything but alternative A¹⁴⁶ even though Edinburgh by this time had got down to the business of launching the Diploma and preparing an Ordinance for the degree.¹⁴⁷ Drever had clearly played a major part in pushing the matter on and indeed was to be promoted from Assistant to Lecturer in order to teach the Diploma¹⁴⁸ but the influence of the Associations and of the Provincial Committee and its Director of Studies, Morgan, had also been strong.¹⁴⁹ By the beginning of 1915, the Faculty of Arts had sufficiently overcome its early reluctance to envisage more than alternative B, that it now felt able to describe the new Diploma as "practically equivalent to an Honours degree in this subject"¹⁵⁰ and possibly hoped that the matter could now be shelved without further action. In fact, however, after two years of meetings, the matter had gone too far. The Edinburgh plan was now secure and apart from making some minor modifications suggested by the other universities, the controversies there were over. The full Degree Ordinance went forward.

In Glasgow, however, things were rather different. Throughout 1914 the Senate simply repeated its view that alternative A was enough despite protests from the SEA, the EIS, its own General Council and the Court itself.¹⁵¹ In April 1914 the G.C. sent a thoughtful resolution on the subject to the Court¹⁵² but by the end of the year and despite the progress in Edinburgh, all that had happened was the establishment of a joint Court/Senate committee to see if any possible use could be made of the old 1900 Teacher's Diploma regulations – a Diploma that the secularisation of the Colleges had effectively killed off in 1907.¹⁵³ By March 1915 all that the Glasgow Senate could suggest was a move to Alternative B,¹⁵⁴ already rejected by the Associations many years earlier and long since seen as impracticable, at least at the undergraduate level, in Edinburgh. On their instructions Boyd prepared a detailed plan on the lines of B¹⁵⁵ though the Court delayed proceedings following a request from the General Council which had called for a meeting of all four General Councils to consider the general situation, and the Edinburgh proposals in particular.¹⁵⁶

All this had brought a crisis for those who sought a uniform degree for the profession throughout Scotland and the General Councils of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen duly sent delegates to yet another conference in the Station Hotel, Perth.¹⁵⁷ This meeting reaffirmed their joint opposition to B and they inserted a clause in support of a Faculty into their communique, which was full of florid language, Latin tags and references to Papal Bulls.¹⁵⁸ This document clearly affected events in the remaining three universities and invested the Edinburgh plan for a post-graduate BEd degree with the quality of a national prototype though the pedantry of the Perth author was to lead the remaining three to prefer instead of the Edinburgh BEd the title EdB (on the analogy of LLB and PhD) though his grammatical reasons for the preference are not entirely clear, given the equally prevalent use of MA and BD as short forms.¹⁵⁹

Meanwhile the press campaign continued with the forceful Scottish correspondent of *School World* inveighing in particular against the Glasgow and Aberdeen Senates' preference for B: "But teachers," he reported, "have refused to accept this even as an instalment of their demands" and, he was rightly convinced, "the approaching general meetings of the various associations of teachers will emphatically endorse this view."¹⁶⁰ and, indeed, the following January (1916) a letter was despatched to all three remaining Courts, a letter described somewhat dramatically in the Glasgow Court Minutes as being "signed in the name of the Primary and Secondary Teachers of Scotland"¹⁶¹ though in St. Andrews what is apparently the same letter is described as from the EIS.¹⁶² This strongly supported the Edinburgh Ordinance and advocated it as the ideal model, in the words of Morgan, "one of the most comprehensive degrees ... offered by an English-speaking university which will influence the system and advance the status of teachers".¹⁶³ As a result of some minor inter-university disputes over the Edinburgh model, the failure to heal which would have been, according to the *Secondary School Journal* "nothing short of a disaster" for the future of Scottish education¹⁶⁴ representatives of the Glasgow and Edinburgh Courts met in the capital,

and, according to Rusk,¹⁶⁵ Principal MacAllister of Glasgow was already so impressed by the teachers' case and by the final draft of the Edinburgh Ordinance that he himself drafted an almost identical Glasgow Ordinance in the train on the return journey. This he submitted to the Court on June 8th.¹⁶⁶ He knew that the Edinburgh Court was already pressing its own Senate to complete its revisions "with as little delay as possible"¹⁶⁷ and he also decided to be firm.

Rusk actually claimed some credit for the Principal's enthusiasm. After completing his doctorate at Jena, he (Rusk) had, according to the custom of the time, gone to Cambridge as an undergraduate and had taught in the Presbyterian Nursery School with Lady MacAllister. He had struck up a friendship with the couple and claimed to have converted the husband to the importance of experimental education in the universities of the future. But MacAllister must in any case have been well aware of German and American developments if only through the constant badgering of GC, EIS and SEA. Moreover he believed in a general expansion of research and was, as Chairman of the Empire Bureau, to play an important role in imposing the "short" PhD on a reluctant British academia in the years following the war.¹⁶⁸ At Glasgow he was particularly dedicated to the expansion of numbers, raising them from just under 3,000 in 1911 to almost 5,000 in 1921.¹⁶⁹ He was probably reluctant therefore to let pass such an opportunity to expand the university's work among such a large and key profession. Moreover his Committee work was exceptionally skilful. Bower later described him as a Glasgow "accelerator" with a complete mastery of detail in all three governing bodies of the university.¹⁷⁰ Hence his apparently confident decision to set about the defeat of the Senate on this issue and even Boyd, still an enthusiast for C, was, he admitted, "overborne".¹⁷¹

He first of all drew up an Ordinance without any prior consultation with the Senate, the Faculty of Arts or even Boyd and a month later (on July 6th) gained provisional approval for it from the Court.¹⁷² Three months later (on October 12th) the Senate adopted its usual delaying tactic of referring the Ordinance to all the Faculties

but he clearly insisted on an early reply.¹⁷³ Three weeks later (on November 2nd) the key Faculties of Arts, Sciences and Medicine withheld approval¹⁷⁴ and five days later (November 7th) the Senate reported to the Court that they considered the degree unnecessary.¹⁷⁵ The Court accepted some minor amendments but on December 14th when Professor Paton, in the Court, moved that it should all be postponed for six months, only he and one other professor voted in favour and the Principal's motion, seconded by a non-academic member, that the Ordinance should be approved, was carried *nem. con.*¹⁷⁶ After this rebuff from the Court, there was no further discussion in the Senate. The Ordinance was sent to the other universities and to the Privy Council, and the lie was clearly given to the notion that in all academic matters, a Scottish Senate's opinion must be supreme. By June 1917 the Ordinance had Royal Approval and the Senate had to swallow its pride and get down to the framing of EdB course regulations.¹⁷⁷

In the two smaller universities things moved more slowly and less dramatically. As late as 1914, the Aberdeen G.C., were still apparently willing, if necessary, to accept B and gained Senate approval for this on 30th June.¹⁷⁸ In March of the following year; the Court also discussed this MA plan¹⁷⁹ but alongside this appeared a post-graduate plan which, following the national fashion, the G.C. now appeared to prefer although some members of the Senate took the early Glasgow line (on financial as much as academic grounds) of suggesting that there was already ample provision in the Doctorate system for a post-graduate Education degree.¹⁸⁰ At the beginning of 1916 the Aberdeen Students Representative Council always more alive to Teacher issues than its counterparts elsewhere, passed a motion firmly supporting the General Council's post-graduate plan¹⁸¹ and a month later the Court set about preparing an Ordinance.¹⁸² Certainly they did so with bad grace reporting that they were only doing so because "in view of the present situation, it has become necessary". Even so, later in the year, in a unique gesture, they invited the G.C. to participate in the process.¹⁸³ The Committee had almost completed the draft when suddenly its work was

suspended in one of those bursts of goodwill towards the teaching profession that seem to have regularly occurred in Aberdeen. "At this stage," they reported to the Court on 13th March 1917, "a proposal has been made ... of such importance with regard to the position of Education in the University that they have resolved to report it to the Court for its decision."¹⁸⁴ In fact it was yet again a reemergence of the EIS's perennial suggestion for a Chair and a Faculty, a suggestion which as usual got nowhere¹⁸⁵ and the work was resumed. By the end of 1916 the drafting had made some progress¹⁸⁶ but another year was to elapse before it was completed,¹⁸⁷ owing perhaps to the wide consultation that the Court had decided upon. Even then eventual approval was to be delayed by an unexpected factor, a dispute over the title of the degree.

In fact the Aberdeen proposals were very little different in shape and content from those elsewhere but a powerful group in the Court, led by the Principal himself, were determined that it should be called a Master's and not a Bachelor's degree. For this they advanced three reasons when asked by a worried Privy Council Officer in June 1917. First (somewhat mysteriously) they pointed to the fact that it might well eventually include a special course on "The Principles of Biology"; second (showing great foresight) they foresaw the eventual use of the term BEd for a first degree designed specifically for teachers and third, they included a reminder that there was already a new and rather similar degree of M.Ed. in Manchester and they did not wish the Scottish degree to sound inferior.¹⁸⁸

In fact, in January 1918, the Senate had by 10 votes to 3 decided in favour of "Bachelor"¹⁸⁹ but such a change was negated a month later by a vote of 6-3 in the Court where "Master" was strongly defended by the Principal¹⁹⁰ who, like MacAllister, was quite prepared to veto the Senate's decision on what might have appeared to be a purely academic matter. The other three universities, however, led apparently by St. Andrews¹⁹¹ were equally determined¹⁹² and at the meeting of Principals already mentioned, the matter was discussed in the Station Hotel, Perth on November 2nd.¹⁹³

The opponents based their case on the analogy of the "professional" Bachelorships already existing in Law, Divinity and Medicine, a highly gratifying comparison for the Teachers' associations. Moreover they pointed out that although Manchester had called its degree Master in Education, "the Scottish Degrees ... would have such intrinsic value apart from their designation that they would not be at a disadvantage in being styled Bachelorships".¹⁹⁴ They said that for their part they had "made up their minds decisively" and the Privy Council spokesman made clear that Aberdeen would either have to toe the line or risk outright and unanimous opposition to their Ordinance on the part of the other Universities, followed by certain Privy Council rejection. Under such pressure, Aberdeen naturally gave in,¹⁹⁵ though Drever, for one, was later to express regret that the Aberdeen proposal was not accepted, leading as it did to confusion in other English-speaking countries.

Events at St. Andrews, meanwhile, were least spectacular of all. Certainly scepticism was present there, judging from a student article entitled *Education Research* on the possibly high correlation between baldness and brains¹⁹⁶ though, in 1910, it had introduced a special course in Education that clearly reflected modern thinking.¹⁹⁷ There, however, the General Council was the weakest in Scotland and pressure had to come from elsewhere. After the very early but false start of December 1912, except for one resolution from the General Council,¹⁹⁸ nothing happened in the University governmentally speaking, for over four years until 17th March 1917, when the Principal suddenly told the Court that, in view of events elsewhere, he personally had prepared an Ordinance for a Bachelor of Education degree.¹⁹⁹ This rapidly went through committee and was sent to the Senate and General Council on 7th July.²⁰⁰ What might have seemed the Principal's high-handed gesture met with almost total approval. The Senate insisted on a reference to Education and Psychology instead of one to Psychology and Education and the General Council asked to be "informed" of any changes in the regulations²⁰¹ but once those points were dealt with, the St. Andrews degree became a reality, even though

they were to wait forty years for the first graduate to appear.

Given the number of years that had to pass between the institution and completion of the issue in St. Andrews, it seems unlikely that Edgar was a prime mover. Moreover, for reasons to be discussed later, any enthusiasm he might have shown would have been unlikely to carry much weight and might even have been counter-productive. We do not know, either, how far the Principal consulted him during the drafting. What is remarkable is the eventually smooth passage of the measure given the generally parlous state of Educational Studies both in St. Andrews and Dundee and it may well have owed a great deal to the St. Andrews professoriate's current, unique interest in secondary school pedagogy noted earlier, though within a very few years, the same Professors were, as we shall see, quite happy to see the Chair's total disappearance.

Equally remarkable elsewhere was the slowness with which the degree was to attract candidates, despite the intense pressure from the teaching profession, especially in the General Councils, that had resulted in its institution. At Edinburgh, three candidates completed the full degree in 1918 but in Glasgow, despite the Ordinance's taking effect in 1917, only three candidates were to appear there by 1920 and there were now doubts about the efficacy of the degree as a means of raising status. As Leash had warned at the beginning of the campaign "it is absurd to think that the teacher, with (or without) his degree will ever rank with the doctor or the minister... The Public here is the real judge and not Educational Congresses."²⁰²

However, under the Regulations, the completion of the first part of the course, whose content overlapped considerably with existing undergraduate courses in Education and Psychology, could earn the award of a Diploma and this part of the course was successfully instituted in Edinburgh in 1914, anticipating by some months the final passing of the Ordinance for the full degree.

To Drever, the institution of the Edinburgh Diploma with a definite demand for

work at a higher level than the Ordinary MA "was really a very important development ... of the teaching of psychology in Scottish universities", giving Psychology a definite place as a compulsory subject in a university course. Indeed, he saw the enthusiasm which it created in students as a major reason for Darroch's conversion to the idea of a full Ordinance, something which his plans for a mere Honours undergraduate course could have avoided. He also saw it as the first opening of the path to full German/American style research in the subject²⁰³ and the Blue Book noted how its introduction had coincided with "the first fruits" of experimental work at Moray House - Miss Drummond's experiments with Montessori apparatus in the Free Kindergarten of the Canongate.²⁰⁴

Candidates for the Diploma were certainly meant to provide a pool of ability from which hopefully, candidates for the full degree could later be selected, though in St. Andrews even the Diploma section of the Regulations was never activated until after a new Professor had been appointed in 1925.

As in 1905-07 the Faculty and Columbia Teachers College enthusiasts hailed the institution of the degree as a fresh dawn. The teachers' organisations, though their Education Reform Committee, welcomed the degree²⁰⁵ and the usual demands for Glasgow and Aberdeen chairs did not take long to appear,²⁰⁶ especially as earmarked Carnegie money was now said to be available in the latter university.²⁰⁷ But, as usual, nothing happened and the demand got lost amid the demands and crises of the post-war world.

What did not get lost, however, was the appeal of the German/American models. Drever, Darroch, Boyd and Clarke in Aberdeen all drew attention to the need to develop "experimental education", testing and surveying alongside the Philosophy and History of the traditional courses. A new type of Scottish professional academic began to emerge to meet the demands of the degree and its linked activities. Drever's successor as Darroch's Assistant Lecturer, once he had himself become Combe

Lecturer in Psychology,²⁰⁸ was Kennedy-Fraser. After taking a conventional Edinburgh degree, he had studied for two years under Meumann at Leipzig and then at Hamburg. In 1912 he had gone to America to work under Titchener and Whipple in Cornell, replacing the latter when he went to Columbia. After army service, he combined his Education post under Darroch with that of principal lecturer in Psychology at Moray House. Later he was to become the first Psychologist to Glasgow Education Committee. Thus in one career he embodied many of the elements that produced and nurtured a new degree which though firmly established in the university, had strong links with the now affluent and well equipped College world. Symbolically the removal of the Edinburgh Provincial Committee's Offices from the University to Moray House was notified to the Edinburgh Court on the same day that they first discussed the degree proposals²⁰⁹ and the reference groups of people like Kennedy-Fraser were to be far more varied than those of Darroch and Edgar, let alone Laurie and Meiklejohn. He was therefore a real symbol of the new situation. According to Wright, one of the first Edinburgh graduates, Darroch was glad to get rid of him.²¹⁰

NOTES

1. In Clarke (1919) p 30. *School World* Jan 1915 claimed that "an absolute uniformity prevails from John O'Groats to Maidenkirk. It is safe to say that not a single educational experiment is being tried throughout the secondary schools of the country".
2. Clarke in Aberdeen, for example, faced with a graduating class of 100 had to appeal to the Court for assistance. Aber C 10 Nov 1908.
3. Edin Sen 2 Jun 1905.
4. Maclean (1917) who eventually, on hearing that an education degree had been established in Edinburgh felt that this must be the formal institution of a Faculty of Education.
5. Brubacher (1947) p 514 discerns a similar desire to emulate the well-established professions in the post-graduate degrees at Columbia.
6. E.g. Malloch in Clarke (1919) p 264.
7. Coverage could be even more wide-ranging. As early as 3 Jul 1886 *Educational News* had printed a note by the Prime Minister of New Zealand on their proposed degrees in Pedagogy and on 28 Dec 1889 they printed a long article on training procedures in Japan.
8. *Educational Review* XIII. Mar 1897, cited by Simpson (1983) p 70.
9. Holman quoted by Selleck (1968) p 227.
10. Armytage (1969) p 67. Rusk (BQ) also suggested that Herbart's wife was English by descent.
11. *Secondary School Journal* Oct 1914. "Is it too much to hope," wrote Boyd, "that Scotland, which has kinship in intellectual and moral genius with both Germany and England may be able to play a part worthy of her great educational traditions ... ?"
12. Burnet of St. Andrews and a leading anti-Prussian even before the war - see, for example, his address to Secondary Education Congress in May 1913 (Burnet 1917) - delighted in the fact that even Donaldson had had to omit his usual eulogy of German education from his Inaugural Address to the students in October 1914 (Burnet (1929) p 183). Burnet himself (p 186) was to carry the anti-German argument to ridiculous extremes, suggesting that German method was only useful if used by Frenchmen, Italians or Englishmen, and that most great Germans were dead by 1830 with even Goethe and Beethoven being politically suspect.
13. See, for example, Edinburgh Court Minutes throughout late 1914 and early 1915 which make it somewhat unlikely that the University was currently being asked to provide a degree based essentially on German approaches. This suggests that its American antecedents were more potent in argument at the time.

14. Glas Sen 16 Jan 1913. He had unsuccessfully asked to be awarded a Glasgow doctorate on the basis of his recent book.
15. BQ interview with Rusk.
16. Rusk (1912) p 294.
17. Rusk (1912) p 4 "the questions employed are ambiguous owing to inadequate analysis and the statistics are frequently vitiated by the factor of 'selection'". This view is echoed by Chapman, quoted by Hearnshaw (1964) p 268 ff, though Welsh (1939) p 64, rather more charitably refers to it as the "popular side" of Experimental Psychology while the American, Monroe, found its British growth 'astounding' (Monroe (1899)). Claperede (1911) pp 16-17, making one of the few continental comments on the British movement is more appreciative, linking it to the traditions of Galton and Pearson.
18. Boyd (1950) p 426, admitted that he was first attracted to the scientific study of education by reading the *Paidologist*. See also Boyd Autobiography p 162.
19. Donaldson (1874) p 36.
20. For example, Conrad (1885), published in Glasgow and translated by Hutchinson, a master at Glasgow High School.
21. Findlay (1910) p 6. "In 1890 scarcely any English teacher knew of Herbart's existence; by 1896 almost everyone in the Training Colleges were talking and teaching the new pedagogies".
22. *School World* Jul 1903.
23. Edin Sen 31 Jan 1903. He no doubt had in mind the boosting of Darroch's candidacy for the Chair.
24. Adams (1980) p 31 "As an academic philosopher Herbart must have had an intellectual history. Yet important aspects of this development remain obscure."
25. Hofstadter and Hardy (1952) p 62.
26. Johanningmeier (1980) p 54.
27. Bledstein (1976) p 68.
28. Bailyn (1963) p 216. Judd (1918) p iii outlines in detail how the History of Education was replaced, as an introductory course, by more widely based studies.
29. Rugg (1947) p 719.
30. Laurie (1912) p 200.
31. Selleck (1968) p 208.
32. He continually acknowledged his debt to Laurie and Darroch even

in a psychological context, see Drever (1922) *passim*.

33. Boyd (1933) p 64.
34. In Clayton (1960) p 3.
35. Rugg (1947) p 723.
36. As late as 1981, Torrance (p 47) was accusing it of having an anti-intellectual influence in England.
37. Thorndike (1929) p 141-5. Selleck (1968) p 293 suggests that the alliance of free-ranger and rigid scientist worked well "... if the scientific educationist had been as rigidly scientific as he wanted others to be, he might never have met with the success he did".
38. Cremin (1965) p 3.
39. Murchison (1936) Vol 2 p 14.
40. Selleck (1968) p 211 quoting a manifesto of the New Ideals group.
41. Rugg (1952) p 28.
42. Harvard Committee (1966).
43. *Glasgow University Magazine* 28 Jan 1909.
44. Ballard (1920) p 46.
45. Judd (1918) p 319 makes it clear how even at that comparatively late date, Americans deferred to Germany, seeing in their secondary training programme "the most highly developed ... in the world ... not at all likely ... to be followed in the United States".
46. Adams (1922).
47. Knight (1951) p 84.
48. Rusk (1932) p 15.
49. *School World* Dec 1906. Geddes was also a prominent member of the Child Study Movement in Scotland *Paidologist passim* and lectured regularly at St. George's. Welsh (1939) p 43.
50. Cremin (1962) p 129.
51. Roscoe (1917) p 220.
52. See, for example, *Teachers Guild Quarterly* Jun 2 1913.
53. On America, see Fitch (1890) *passim*. Hinsdale in *Educational Review (New York)* Feb 1900 p 105. Burke (1983) pp 114-5. On Germany, see McClelland (1980) p 177.
54. *Journal of Experimental Pedagogy* Mar 1911 though an historical article by Walton in the earlier journal (*Training College Record* Mar

1908) had drawn attention to the "ancient nature of many apparent novelties".

55. Letter of 21 May 1901 (Balfour Papers, British Library) cited by Simpson (1983) p 71.
56. These figures include English and Welsh teachers in training so that the percentage of actual research students is considerably less. Simpson (1983) p 1.
57. Brehaut (1973) p 10.
58. See chapter 8 below.
59. Ogren (1953) p 140-1.
60. Rugg (1947) p 720.
61. Findlay (1903) p 18.
62. Hayward (1912). This was a reaction to the so-called *Holmes Circular* which advocated a return to the old "varsity-man" inspectors of Victorian times.
63. SED Report 1920-21 p 15.
64. Terman (1919) p iii.
65. *School World* Oct 1913.
66. *Secondary School Journal* May 1908.
67. Browne (1979) p 18.
68. *University Review* Oct 1905.
69. Edin Sen 2 Nov 1901.
70. St A C 16 Sep 1912.
71. Edin C 14 Jan 1907.
72. The first mention of a course on "The Social Background of the School Child" appears in the Edinburgh Calendar for 1954-55; one of the four lecturers listed is Burns, later to be the first Edinburgh Professor of Sociology.
73. *Secondary School Journal* Oct 1914.
74. This was part of an integrating movement which produced a major reaction later in the century. See chapter 1.
75. Adams (1929) p 1. "As an enthusiastic young lecturer in education, I ... urged my students to follow the general example and capture a science".
76. Hearnshaw (1979) p 17.

77. The significant figure of Stout first at Aberdeen and then at St. Andrews can, according to Knight, be regarded as irrelevant to any study of psychology in relation to education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XVI Part 2.
78. Boring (1950) pp 467-8. "(His) name is probably better known than his real importance to Psychology would warrant, simply because he was the author of such widely used books".
79. Ironically, its case was being pressed mainly at St. Andrews by the Philosophers (Univ 1910 Report Appendix II. Statements by University Courts) but in his evidence Donaldson admitted having his doubts, "but we may doubt about a thing and yet it may be essential that it should go into the programme" (*ibid.* Evidence p 6).
80. Glas Sen 10 Oct 1907, which records a P C request for the appointment of a lecturer in Psychology. See also *Aberdeen University Review* Autumn 1966 p 295 and Murchison (1936) p 23.
81. Edin Sen 31 Mar 1906.
82. Passmore (1957) p. 12. "In the writings of Bain, the British empiricist tradition passes into psychology as we now understand it".
83. *Aberdeen University Review* Autumn 1966 p 293. See also Tibble (1966) p 6. Withrington in Smith and Hamilton (1980) p 2 draws attention to the earlier work there of Pirie of Marischal College, which could also be clearly deemed psychological.
84. Murchison (1936) p 24. The Trustees seem to have exercised a stronger control over the Lecturer's operations than did the Bell Trustees over the Education Chair. Edin C 13 Feb 1911.
85. Murchison (1936) pp 26-34.
86. In 1908-09 he visited Germany on an SED scholarship. *ibid.*
87. *University of Edinburgh Journal* Autumn 1925.
88. SED Report 1924-26 p 10. "Much is hoped from the criticism which his English and American experience will enable him to apply to the Scottish system".
89. BQ interview with Young.
90. Boring (1950) pp 460-1. While praising them, however, this American historian of Psychology still felt that "all in all Britain lags far behind America and came finally to lead Germany only because Nazi culture strangled scientific activity". According to Hearnshaw (1964) it was second only to Rivers' Laboratory in Cambridge.
91. Boyd (1939) p 200.
92. In his autobiography, Boyd describes his own sudden abandoning

of traditional academic writing style when in September 1919 he embarked on a new journalistic task as Scottish correspondent of the *Journal of Education* which suddenly freed him from "all the bothering about words that had made my previous writing such a labour and so I have continued ... ever since" Boyd Autobiography p 207.

93. Drever (1921).
94. Thorndike (1929) which lists 439 published items by Hall. Interestingly Boyd notes how he became disillusioned with Hall's "scientific" approach. Boyd Autobiography p 195.
95. Boyd (1921-69) and Boyd (1956).
96. Rusk (1918-54) (1928a).
97. *Secondary School Journal* Oct 1912.
98. BQ interview with Inglis.
99. Drever (1912).
100. Darroch (1911) consists of lectures given in Edinburgh, Dundee and Aberdeen. His thesis was that, for the teacher, the approach to Psychology should be "teleological or biological" i.e. endeavouring "to interpret mental development in terms of purpose or as adjustment of means to ends".
101. See the analysis of some BQ responses in chapter 8.
102. Valentine (1914-39).
103. Davie (1973) pp 11-12.
104. As early as 1906, it had been used by Pringle-Pattison as an argument in favour of establishing the Combe Lectureship. He also emphasised the possibility of use by the Provincial Committee. Edin Sen 31 Mar 1906.
105. Rusk (1912) p 291.
106. Sutherland and Sharp (1980) p 187 quotes his letter to Kimmins (Mar 1914) in which he said he had "come to realise in a very concrete way that a psychologist who is doing educational work is really starting a new and independent science. Educational psychology is not merely a branch of applied psychology. Medicine is not simply applied physiology. He has to work out almost every problem afresh." Although half a century later, he seems to have modified his opinion, in rejecting the Scottish notion of teacher psychologists (see chapter 9 below) "After all an educational psychologist is primarily a psychologist not an educationist". *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society* Jan 1969.
107. *Teachers Guild Quarterly* 15 Mar 1906.
108. *School World* Dec 1901. He was addressing the West of Scotland branch of the British Child Study Association.

109. C C Report 1905 p 752.
110. Clarke (1919) p 269-71.
111. Training of Teachers Joint Committee (1897) pp 9-10. "The Committee ... felt that the permanent interests of Higher Education would be better safeguarded if 'Education' was treated as a *post-graduate* study with a rank parallel to the studies preparatory to other professions". This was a Committee of "the Various Societies of Secondary Teachers".
112. *Secondary School Journal* Oct 1909. The following year an article in *Educational News* (2 Sep 1910) drew attention also to a new London Diploma, which combined a conventional theory course with the presentation of a thesis which could be in History, Administration, Methodology (*sic*) or Experimental Pedagogy.
113. Glas Pedagogical Society Minutes 28 Nov 1913. In his talk Logie actually referred to common fears that by way of the degree, the Universities would simply take over dominance of the system from the SED.
114. SED Report 1912-13 p 44. Struthers' own agreement with what happened in Edinburgh is notified on p 310 of the Edin P C minutes for 1913-14.
115. Simpson (1983) p 67. These were the "long" (i.e. five year) DSc, DLitt and DPhil established in Scotland during the 1890s, which had suffered from the rivalry of the "short" German PhDs which Scots such as Rusk found it easier to obtain. This may explain why Rusk was so anxious to obtain a Scottish doctorate on the basis of his book *Experimental Education*. See note 14 above.
116. A similar suggestion for a teacher's degree "demanding a higher standard of culture than that implied in the BA degree" had been suggested to the Bryce Commission by Daniel, the former head of Battersea Training College (Evidence 13, 797-801).
117. An Advanced Course in Education of a non-qualifying nature was all that had been proposed so far (15 Mar 1909), though Laurie envisaged that his own Diploma Course would be "higher than the MA pass and on the Honours standard" Laurie (1899) p 21. In the same year (1909) Boyd had placed before the Glasgow Court a staffing proposal for a new secondary teacher's undergraduate course but it had got nowhere (Glas C 10 Jun 1909 and 11 Nov 1909). The academic proposal had originally reached the Senate on 12 Apr 1909.
118. Lindroth (1976) pp 208-9 notes how a special MA for Secondary Teachers had formed part of the Arts Curriculum Reform that had paralleled the 1908 changes in Scotland while Thomas (1983) p 139 points out that an undergraduate Honours degree in Education was to be established in the University of Wales by 1912.
119. Murchison (1936) p 27.
120. Curiously, the same objections were not widely made in Scotland

to the post-Robbins BEd which promised to accord at least some form of graduate status to women teachers who would otherwise have been denied it.

121. *School World* Feb 1914.
122. See chapter 1, note 104.
123. St A G C 28 Oct 1911.
124. C C Report 1907 p 435.
125. *School World* Jun 1912. "As the Scottish Universities are strongly imitative in their policy, it may confidently be assumed that the good example set by the premier university will soon be followed by others", though four years later the same journal was to suggest that Aberdeen and Glasgow opposed the initial Edinburgh Ordinance on the grounds that they did not want the degree (Jan 1916). Certainly Edinburgh was still being taken as a model in the Glasgow Education Board of Studies as late as 16 Feb 1932. Darroch always felt hampered by the fact that Edinburgh had to keep in step with the other three. Darroch (1903) p 28.
126. Morgan was an earnest supporter of the Edinburgh scheme throughout, no doubt hoping to see his College merged with the University as a result. The *Secondary School Journal* Oct 1912 notes a letter to the SEA Council appealing for their support "in promoting a movement". The same journal in Oct 1913 noted the general encouragement the SEA was receiving from the Training Colleges over this matter.
127. Edin G C 27 Oct 1911.
128. Edin C 13 May 1912.
129. Edin Sen 6 Jun 1912.
130. Edin C 30 Oct 1912.
131. Davie (1985?).
132. St A C 17 Dec 1912. Here the degree was from the start referred to as post-graduate.
133. For the validity of this comment, see chapter 9 below.
134. Judd (1918) p 319. The possibility of such a development in Payne's Michigan had been noted by Fitch as early as 1890. Fitch (1890) p 76.
135. Edin P C 28 May 1913.
136. *School World* Oct 1913.
137. *Ibid.* Nov 1913.
138. Edin Sen 4 Dec 1913.

139. This meeting was on 8 Nov 1913 and was reported in the *Secondary School Journal* -Feb 1914. Turner was possibly depressed by the thought of his Faculty of Arts being swamped with teacher trainees.
140. *Ibid.* Feb 1914. Darroch made clear that at Edinburgh only a post-graduate degree was being considered but Boyd favoured a degree that could be taken in a year less time than was required for the MA.
141. Murchison (1936) p 27.
142. *Ibid.*
143. Edin P C 28 May 1913.
144. Edin C 17 Nov 1913.
145. G U Pedagogical Society Minutes 3 Dec 1913.
146. Glas Sen 15 Jan 1914.
147. Edin C 19 Jan 1914.
148. Edin C 15 Jun 1914.
149. This is clear from the Court minutes Jun-Nov 1913.
150. Edin Sen 4 Feb 1915.
151. At its meeting on 4 Jun 1914 it simply repeated the January reply.
152. Glas C 14 May 1914.
153. Glas C 1 Oct 1914.
154. Glas Sen 18 Mar 1915.
155. Glas C 22 Apr 1915.
156. Glas C 1 Jul 1915. In fact, the Glasgow Court at first opposed the Edinburgh Ordinance but over the technical matters of the length of the course and the Senate's powers rather than over the fundamental idea of the degree. Glas C 11 Nov 1915.
157. A meeting particularly approved of, by the *Secondary School Journal* Nov 1915. St. Andrews were unable to muster a delegation in time.
158. Glas G C 27 Oct 1915.
159. In any case, for some years, both short forms were used in Glasgow even in official documents. See e.g. the use of BEd in Glasgow Education Board of Study Minutes 10 Mar 1920.
160. *School World* Aug 1915.

161. Glas C 13 Jan 1916.
162. St A C 22 Jun 1916.
163. *School World* Jun 1916.
164. *Secondary School Journal* Nov 1915.
165. In a BQ interview.
166. Glas C 8 Jun 1916.
167. Edin Sen 4 May 1916.
168. Simpson (1983) p 127.
169. Stewart (1927) p 133.
170. *Glasgow University Magazine* 23 Oct 1929.
171. Boyd Autob p 210 and this view was borne out by Gardner to BQ. On this period in general Boyd's Autobiography is of no detailed help, he himself admitting that for personal reasons, his account of the years 1907-14 are, like Goethe's, "more *Dichtung* than *Wahrheit*" *ibid.* p 201.
172. Glas C 6 Jul 1916.
173. Glas Sen 12 Oct 1916.
174. Glas Sen 2 Nov 1916.
175. Glas Sen 7 Nov 1916.
176. Glas C 14 Dec 1916.
177. McAllister continued to take an interest in developments through holding the post of chairman of the Education Board of Studies.
178. For a full discussion of the possible courses of action see *Aberdeen University Review* Feb 1914.
179. Aber C 9 Mar 1915.
180. Aber Sen 25 May 1915. Report from the Board of Studies in Philosophy which was also of the opinion that the institution of a post-graduate degree in Education "means a separate Faculty of Education which cannot, at any rate at the present moment, be seriously considered".
181. Aber C 11 Jan 1916.
182. Aber C 8 Feb 1916.
183. See, for example, Aber C 23 Nov 1916 and 11 Dec 1917. See also Simpson (1963) p 44 ff and *Aberdeen University Review* Jun 1917.

184. Aber C 13 Mar 1917.
185. A letter from the Senate pointed out that "the present state of educational equipment in the university" prevented any such idea being considered. (They were simply repeating the Philosophy Board of Studies view of two years before.) Aber C 12 Jun 1917. So far as the Chair was concerned, shortage of resources continued for many years to be the stock answer to EIS requests. See for example, Aber Sen 10 Jun 1919 when the reply claimed that "the University authorities have had this matter before them for a considerable time and are fully alive to the desirability of such a chair being founded".
186. Aber C 14 Nov 1916.
187. Aber C 13 Nov 1917.
188. Aber C 24 Jun 1917.
189. Aber Sen 22 Jan 1918.
190. Aber C 19 Feb 1918.
191. Aber C 11 Jun 1918. In fact, the opposition was led by Burnet. St A C 13 Apr 1918.
192. In fact, Edinburgh might not have been so determined a few years earlier. In May 1910 it had taken exception to a St. Andrews proposal of a BPhil or BLitt to be taken concurrently with or after an MA and spoke of the "academic anomaly of making a Bachelor's degree follow a Master's degree" though they did add "in the same subject", thus excluding the existing professional Bachelor degrees from their strictures. Edin C 16 May 1910.
193. Glas C 7 Nov 1918 gives an outside view of the event.
194. From the full minutes of the meeting Aber C 19 Nov 1918.
195. Aber C 19 Nov 1918, though *School World* Jun 1918 had attacked the tendency of the Scottish universities to look "with a critical and envious eye on every favoured step of each individual university ... It paralyses action, stops progress and results in endless friction".
196. *College Echoes* 13 Nov 1914.
197. The Calendar for 1910-11 averred that "the lectures (would) deal with the results of Experimental Psychology and Pedagogy as they bear upon school work and with modern educational problems". Valentine had presumably become Edgar's Assistant, in order to help teach this course.
198. St A G C 29 Jan 1916.
199. St A C 17 Mar 1917.
200. St A C 7 Jul 1917.

201. St A 8 Feb 1918. This Court meeting received notes of approval from both the Senate and General Council.
202. *Alma Mater* 10 Jun 1914.
203. Murchison (1936) p 28.
204. SED Report 1913-14 p 13.
205. Pamphlet of the Scottish Education Reform Committee (1917). Its members included Boyd and Morgan along with representatives of the main teacher organisations.
206. E.g. from the EIS at Glasgow. Glas C 12 May 1919. In Aberdeen, the earlier movement, already noted, had included an appeal from the College Director of Studies. *Alma Mater* 1917.
207. *Journal of Education* Mar 1920.
208. This followed the death of Smith during the influenza epidemic. Drever was later to attribute to him the real credit for the establishment of Experimental Psychology in relation to Education. Murchison (1936) p 30.
209. Edin C 17 Nov 1913.
210. This account of Kennedy-Fraser's career is derived from an obituary in the *British Psychological Society Bulletin* Vol 16 No 50 and from BQ interviews with Wright and Rusk, who regarded him as "the key figure" in the importation of American ideas to Scotland.

CHAPTER 6 THE DEGREE AND AFTER

The establishment of Ordinances in all four universities was certainly regarded as a great event by the world of Scottish education. The Education Reform Committee representing the main teachers' organisations believed that it would "do much to strengthen the influence of the University in the professional education of teaching (and) encourage the advanced study of education and the scientific investigation of educational problems"¹ while the embracing of American academic models and attitudes had now become sufficient for an American (Roman), writing in 1930, to declare that "in no country of Europe does the American investigator of schools find himself more at home than in Scotland".² Symbolically, perhaps, Kilpatrick of Columbia Teachers College had visited every Scottish Training College immediately the war ended.³

Even so, there was still disgruntlement from those who wanted a more basic teaching degree for the whole profession and felt that the new, somewhat elitist degree⁴ should eventually be replaced or supplemented by an undergraduate programme on the lines that Boyd in particular was perennially outlining. Throughout the 20s and 30s elements in the EIS were to keep such a notion alive.⁵

Even those who were most happy over the degree's establishment had to admit that it still lacked public acceptance as any sort of qualification. In 1922, five years after the passing of the first Ordinance, the *Journal of Education* could still find it "highly creditable" that Edinburgh had produced as many as seven graduates, considering it "has not as yet any very obvious commercial value".⁶ And Edinburgh had in fact been the quickest to get off the ground, attracting students immediately. Elsewhere, despite the preliminary enthusiasm of General Councils and Principals, things moved very slowly. The first Glasgow graduate (not an aspiring professional recruit, but a man in his fifties) did not appear until 1920⁷ while the St. Andrews Court

in September 1919, apologised to a Miss Fulleger of Broughty Ferry about the delay in instituting the degree,⁸ a delay that was to continue for some thirty years. As Boyd put it, "at first nobody seemed interested" and he had to "invent" his first class himself, by persuading a girl he had met in his work at the Glasgow University Settlement to attempt the degree. In fact she dropped out. The response from teachers was initially nil. According to Fleming⁹ it was not widely known outside university circles, despite the part played in its establishment by the EIS and the SEA, and even where it was known and teachers were interested, the university authorities refused to accommodate them by holding classes outside school hours.¹⁰ This was particularly unfortunate at a time when the profession generally could not risk antagonising their employers by working a short day and there was no improvement in the recruitment even after Boyd became President of the EIS in 1921, though he himself had by now overcome his early lack of warmth towards the degree and become an enthusiast.¹¹

The situation in Aberdeen was particularly disappointing. There, a document had been produced by the EIS claiming that 35 graduates and 46 others had intimated to their local Council an intention of attending EdB classes.¹² True, they had insisted that classes should be "at a suitable hour" for serving teachers but the Senate had made considerable efforts to meet that request¹³ and although the "46 others" including some LLAs were eventually ruled out by the regulations, they found it difficult to understand what had happened to the 35 qualified aspirants. In fact the first Aberdeen graduate did not appear until 1923 and he was to be followed by comparatively few others until the 1940s.

Thus, rather unexpectedly in view of the political interest of the degree's establishment, the University departments of both Education and Psychology found themselves for some years still largely concerned with the tasks and problems they had faced since the changes of 1905-07 and, in particular, with their relationship to the Provincial Committees and their Colleges. What research there was, tended, until

the founding of the Scottish Council for Research in Education in 1928, to be on a small scale even when helped by outside funds as in Boyd's EIS Research Committee or in the SED-financed Experimental Education laboratory at Moray House, and much of the energy of Darroch in particular was expended in committees and in negotiation with government. In view of later developments it is worth remembering that when immediately after the second war, Schonell surveyed the whole history of British educational research, he chose to make little mention of the Scottish universities as such,¹⁴ without such an omission provoking controversy.

To some extent, the war put the problems of 1914 into cold storage. The new college buildings which had been completed were on occasions occupied "for national purposes"¹⁵ while the building of new premises was considerably delayed by wartime shortages of labour and materials.¹⁶ Even the recruitment of women teachers had been checked by "the new openings for the employment of women"¹⁷ while Smith, the inspector responsible for colleges, had himself gone to the war almost immediately.¹⁸ He had temporarily handed things back to the retired Scougal with his strong pro-Struthers and anti-university views. Scougal died in 1916 and after that, things seem to have languished so far as day to day action by SED was concerned. No annual reports on teacher training were prepared and they were never again to appear in their lavish pre-war form.

Even so the detailed plans of the pre-war period, including provision for the much delayed enforcement of training on graduates, were ready to be put into operation once the war ended. As Smith put it on his return, "The machinery of training ... is ready and waiting" but he then had to add that "what is wanted is more students".¹⁹ It had been assumed that hordes of ex-servicemen and former women war-workers would flood the universities and colleges as they were to do in the late 1940s, "but," Smith admitted, "these hopes have only been partially realised" and he noted how much more successful medicine and engineering had been in making recruits. The result was that the Provincial Committees proved to have built far beyond their needs

and this was to lead to political difficulty, particularly in Dundee where a magnificent new college was almost immediately declared redundant and only saved by considerable retrenchment²⁰ and manoeuvres involving the University of St. Andrews.

The system of concurrent training also, though it was to continue for many years to come, was beginning to lose some of its attraction and by 1926, Peddie could claim that it was now the general practice to avoid it.²¹ Partly this was because it closed a student's career options at a time when most other graduate occupations were beginning far to outstrip teaching in both salary and status and possibly because the Carnegie grants may have made it easier for the poorer student to scorn the financial support given to what Adams called *educands*²² by SED. The latter was by now actively pursuing a policy of discouraging graduation among elementary teachers (a policy also being pursued in England). Jones notes that in 1918 out of approximately 1,600 students pursuing the non-graduating two year course only 108, mainly in Edinburgh, attended university classes.²³ Even so, all the colleges continued to be dominated by graduates on a scale that made it relatively easy to impose compulsory graduation on male teachers within a few years of the war's ending. Even by 1932, when the college system was already beginning to acquire many of its later characteristics, the quota of places under current restrictions gave 800 to graduates and 200 to non-graduate women.²⁴

It was not difficult therefore despite the disappointments of the 1905-6 settlement still to see far more than mere tenuous links between college and university. Moreover, many of the graduates took the old and by now well established MA course in Education, either as part of their concurrent undergraduate training or (except at St. Andrews) as part of the new Diploma course designed as the first stage of the Education degree itself. Thus the number of students taught directly by the University Education departments remained high and all of them were now staffed by more than one person. The post of Professor's or Lecturer's Assistant became a recognised stepping stone to chairs and other leading posts in both Scotland and the remainder

of the English-speaking world.²⁵ Moreover, both Lecturers and Assistants had also been regularly employed on a part-time basis by Provincial Committees to lecture in the Colleges and thus to establish extra links between the two systems.²⁶ Indeed, there was often a formidable complexity about the salary and pension arrangements for individuals serving both the University Court and the Provincial Committee that must have made it difficult for them to know where their first loyalty lay, though no doubt the prestige of a permanent university appointment carried considerable weight as later quarrels of no great financial significance were to make clear.²⁷

So far as the actual work itself was concerned, it was a period of great excitement in both sectors. Not only was there the degree but one College lecturer from Aberdeen wrote to Cruickshank²⁸ describing how they "discussed with avidity the new ideas that were floating around - new ways of teaching Art from Vienna, the implications of Freud on education, Soviet developments - throwing out often ideas that I hear the young members of staff bringing up today (1967) as desirable and imminent" and as the war ended, there was therefore considerable potential for university/college collaboration in all spheres, and particularly in Education and Psychology. HMI Smith set himself to improve what cooperation there was and clearly failed to share many of Struthers' suspicions. Certainly there existed considerable talent in both sectors, as the contributors' list to the 1922 edition of A.P. Laurie's *Teachers Encyclopaedia* demonstrate.²⁹ Indeed, Smith advocated a return to Craik's original conception of the Provincial Committees as bodies for *linking* the two institutions rather than dividing them, believing that "Training Centres should themselves undertake the professional training but that for the general culture of the students provision, where possible, should be made by arrangement with the neighbouring Universities and Central Institutions".³⁰ Even so, it was a policy difficult to pursue, not merely because some college leaders (following the Scougal line) believed that "cultural" subjects were best taught to teachers in an institution geared to the professional needs of pedagogy³¹ but also because some university professors

in "cultural" subjects believed that they rather than the Colleges were in the best position to advise on how to teach in the secondary schools where so many of them had begun their own careers, an attitude which, as we have seen, was particularly prevalent at St. Andrews.

Despite Smith's aspirations, the University's share in College teaching actually began to decline.³² By 1930 he had to admit that, paradoxically, the establishment of an all-graduate male profession had actually helped to drive the two sectors apart, for it turned the Colleges more and more into specifically professional training centres instead of the Liberal Arts colleges they had had in part to be before Laurie's campaign had made teacher graduation more widespread and this cleavage had had a depressing effect on the colleges' academic atmosphere. This was something Smith had forecast in his report for 1918-19, when as part of a plan for greater University participation in the provision of G, he had noted how "as a general rule the instruction given by whole-time officers of the Training Centres in subjects of general education does not rise much above the level of good secondary school work".³³ At that time, provision in different places varied. At Aberdeen, the University undertook college teaching in both Literature and Science, while in Edinburgh it undertook none at all. There only the "professional" departments of Education and Psychology gave any service to the Provincial Committee.³⁴

So far as those departments' new degree was concerned, Smith was very positive, not only sharing the general optimism of the EIS about its possible general influence on the profession but also recognising the possible value to government of any scientific work that might result from it especially when, in 1925-6, "mathematicians" took over the two Chairs.³⁵ The result was welcome cooperation over the arrangements for the new Diploma from Colleges still very much under the control of an SED not always tolerant even of Provincial Committee opinion. A *Journal of Education* article of 1919 could, significantly both attack government for its rigid control of the colleges and welcome the Edinburgh college's attempts to "make it

easy" for people to work for the post-graduate degree.³⁶ And despite their disappointment over the numbers of recruits for the degree, something which, they surmised, might be as attributable to financial and scheduling constraints as to apathy, the Education and Psychology departments of the universities continued to be optimistic about the future of high level educational studies. They were aware of a general excitement in the post-war educational world, engendered not only by the 1918 Education legislation but by a number of events and movements. A major Scottish initiative, unparalleled elsewhere in the United Kingdom had now brought the Catholic schools and colleges totally into the State system; members of the Reform Committee and the leaders of the various Teachers' Associations were continually in the public eye, while a group of Edinburgh students were "busily engaged on propagandist work" among such students as were in sympathy with a movement whose aim was "to raise the status of the teaching profession by the cultivation of a professional conscience".³⁷ As yet there was little talk of the degree as a course of specialist training for specific groups such as administrators, college lecturers or psychologists, but undoubtedly, the Columbia model remained present in many minds.

Certainly at this time the degree was never thought of as primarily a research degree and the research element, though it was to grow after the second war, was negligible in the early days for reasons which will be discussed in chapter 8. There was just as much if not more considerable emphasis on its attraction as an Honours degree of the undergraduate kind. There seems to have been general acceptance, even in the Colleges, that post-graduate work on the theoretical side of education demanded teaching of university standard. At Oxford, such an argument was concurrently used by Hendy to defend the view that the whole of graduate teacher training must take place in universities,³⁸ a view increasingly held in England. In Scotland, however, the old distinction between TP and t still seemed clear with t now firmly a college responsibility though the most strenuous of college defenders, even Struthers, would be prepared to admit that TP in its BEd/EdB degree form belonged

exclusively to the university.

The new honours degree appeared to offer a peculiar opportunity to two groups in particular: Ordinary graduates and psychologists. Hitherto Ordinary graduates who became teachers had little or no opportunity to improve their academic status, yet they still formed the overwhelming majority of both graduates and teachers. In 1926, Peddie suggests, 60% of the men and 80% of the women in the Faculties of Arts and at least 50% in the Faculties of Science were likely to become teachers' yet in 1920 Ordinary graduates had far outnumbered Honours graduates in three of the universities (Edinburgh 234 to 91; Glasgow 305 to 86 and Aberdeen 165 to 49) while in St. Andrews they outnumbered them more narrowly by 42 to 31.³⁹ The new degree appeared to give the aspiring Ordinary graduate a chance to draw level in a Scotland where any pretence that the general degree was equal or superior to English-style specialisation had probably been long since abandoned even if it had ever been seriously entertained by more than a small minority of traditionalists.

For the psychologists it was an even greater turning point for they had previously had no access at all to an honours degree in their subject and for some thirty years the Scottish Education degree was to provide a major method of entry to the profession, particularly for psychologists specialising in Education.⁴⁰

Moreover, the new ability of the Education and Psychology departments to offer an Honours degree promised to improve their status in the university itself, especially if they could eventually begin to produce an annual crop of graduates as great in number as some of the more long established departments. This prospect gave them a new feeling of self-confidence after years of apprenticeship as the providers of mere options in a degree structure essentially controlled by other people. Not surprisingly, therefore, to meet this new situation, the usual EIS and General Councils campaign continued in the post-war period for chairs at Glasgow and Aberdeen and for Faculties of Education in all four universities.⁴¹

Yet it was on Psychology rather than Education that the major post-war excitement was concentrated. Even in the specifically Education courses of the time there is much of what would later be deemed Psychology present. In the notebooks of the earliest Edinburgh BEd students for example it is difficult to discern the distinction the authorities make between experimental education on the one hand and experimental psychology on the other.⁴² Certainly German style experiment and laboratory work had influenced Provincial Committee planning and staffing even before the war. But the war itself was to have a quite dramatic effect on the development of the psychological profession in Britain.

In the early years of the century the meetings of the entire British Psychological Society (inaugurated in October 1901) could take place in a small room. At a meeting of the Council in January 1904 it was reported that only ten members were up to date with their subscription,⁴³ and the membership included medical professors and philosophers not necessarily committed to the subject on any full time basis, Clouston of Edinburgh, for example, and Latta of Glasgow.⁴⁴ By 1914, membership had crept up to 94 for the whole United Kingdom,⁴⁵ but by 1920 it had risen by over 600% to 631, largely through an influx of RAMC and industrial psychologists influenced by American methods during the war. Of the 631, 366 were classified as "educational" and the society made specific research grants for use among them.⁴⁶ In 1923 a Scottish branch was formed⁴⁷ though London refused to subsidise their travel to central meetings, even to deliver papers.⁴⁸

In such a situation it was not surprising that Drever outstripped Darroch in his enthusiasm for a degree, that so well satisfied this new enthusiasm. In his second edition of *Experimental Education* (1919) Rusk was now able to speak of how well Scotland in general was now placed to take advantage of this and by that time with Lectureships in Psychology were already firmly established in three of the four universities.⁴⁹ The 1896 post at Aberdeen had been less the result of local enthusiasm than the chance outcome of the bizarre legacy by an African missionary with an

enthusiasm for philology (*sic*)⁵⁰. Nevertheless both there and later in his Philosophy chair at St. Andrews, Stout had given the subject firm respectability, albeit largely in a philosophical framework and outside a specifically educational context. His successor, McIntyre, had a far greater concern with teacher-training and having a German training he introduced considerable experimental work to his Department, though in the style typical of many British educational psychologists before 1950, including Drever himself, his eclecticism also embraced Freud, French psycho-pathology and Münsterberg's occupational psychology.⁵¹

The Glasgow lectureship had been endowed in 1906, largely with teacher training in mind⁵² and in Watt had an efficient and forward looking lecturer, a pioneer of the teaching movement in Scotland. Without doubt, however, the Edinburgh department was the most distinguished. There the Combe Lecturer was specifically enjoined to "make provision for the teaching of applied psychology particularly as regards the application of psychology to education" and the first Lecturer, Smith, had set up not merely an undergraduate course but a significant laboratory. Many years after the establishment of the Psychology chair in 1931,⁵³ Drever was still to be described by a publisher as Director of the Combe Laboratory⁵⁴ and the facilities at his disposal were considerably increased by the establishment of the Moray House Laboratory, the first educational laboratory in the British Isles, developed partly in the light of his German experience of Meumann's laboratory in 1913.⁵⁵

In England, Psychology was also developing at a rapid pace in order to cope with the sudden creation of the many new posts inspired by wartime experience of American selection and "adjustment" but despite the establishment of many academic positions, development of Psychology courses there was, Hearnshaw claims, "slower and more patchy" in comparison with Scotland,⁵⁶ where the new Education degree was eventually to prove both a stimulus and a steady provider of personnel.

HMI Smith and his successors at the SED were pleased by this Scottish progress,

particularly as Scotland was to be provided with research teaching and expertise at the expense of the university rather than the College sector, (with, of course, the exception of the Moray House laboratory). The massive injection of funds into the Scottish universities first by Carnegie and later by the UGC relieved the SED of much of the expense of training educational leaders and encouraging scientific development in the pedagogical and testing field. Some judicious expenditure was made – for example, on the costs of foreign trips – but, significantly, when the Scottish Council for Research was eventually founded, its pump-priming funds had come not from government but from the EIS and the local authorities. In this way the SED had the best of both worlds. Much of the most expensive activity in terms of equipment and labour-intensive teaching and research was carried out by the universities, who also helped out with some College teaching at low cost and usually on *ad hoc* terms involving no pension or sickness payments. The universities were naturally encouraged to develop such activities while SED still kept a firm control on teacher supply and the nature of the final training package.

The educational euphoria surrounding the 1918 legislation was soon overtaken by the reduction of estimates and the large scale withdrawal of public funds usually called the "Geddes Axe".⁵⁷ The universities themselves also being hit, a mutual search with government for savings in the teacher training field began and two series of events in particular were to have a considerable influence on the development of the University Education Departments themselves.

The first of these took place in the administrative field and concerned the way in which the Provincial Committee system operated. As a result of the post-war legislation, the form of local government for Scottish education had been changed with County and City authorities replacing the old School Boards and there were to be organisational changes also for the four Provincial Committees. Henceforth, instead of each Committee reporting directly to SED, a National Committee was established to coordinate the work of all four. In effect, it was to establish a national policy and,

where necessary, demand conformity. This system had many attractions for government. It provided the means for a more efficient operation of SED policy and also probably reduced administrative costs, though the advantages of centralised decision-making may on this occasion have outweighed the advantages of short-term savings and while the new Committee's independence might have seemed enhanced by the fact that its first chairman was Darroch, in many ways a noted public critic of SED policies, any power he enjoyed was as financially restricted as it was on his Edinburgh Provincial Committee. Even so his presence increased the credibility and acceptability of the new body among those normally sceptical about SED actions. Certainly any future policy with regard to the universities' role in the training of teachers would, of course, be settled by this new Committee in direct consultation with the University Courts themselves and within a few years they were, jointly, to make a number of extremely important decisions.

In 1920 it seemed likely that Education (in alliance with Psychology) would play an ever greater role in university activity. The enthusiasm of the Principals for the new degree, the financial promise of that degree and HMI Smith's encouragement to the universities to provide more and more G and TP for an increasingly graduate teaching force seemed to augur well for the future but there remained many weaknesses in the Chairs' position, some of them dating from the 1876 settlement itself, and the 1920s had hardly begun before the essentially fragile, though optimistic system of university studies in Education was soon to be attacked once more at what had always been its weakest point in terms of finance and number, St. Andrews.

The particularly unsatisfactory nature of the St. Andrews Chair and its arrangements were to some extent disguised for its first quarter century of operations by the personality and enthusiasm of Meiklejohn, though he never disguised the difficulties. His successor, Edgar, inherited these difficulties, but lacked not only his personality but apparently also common prudence. At first sight, he seemed a promising figure. As we have seen, he was academically respectable by Scottish

standards and came from the same professional stable as Principal Donaldson himself – the High School of Edinburgh. Even so, from the start, he had both unnecessarily antagonised a Senate which had in many ways become remarkably sympathetic towards and interested in pedagogic questions and had failed to carry his case even in the St. Andrews General Council.⁵⁸

In particular, he had handled badly what Meiklejohn had always hoped would solve the St. Andrews chair's problems – the opportunity in Dundee. Meiklejohn had on a number of occasions organised private classes of teachers in that city,⁵⁹ had been an eloquent speaker at the opening ceremony of University College⁶⁰ and had assumed that, with the incorporation of the Dundee University College into St. Andrews University, the Chair's opportunity would come at last. In fact, however, for many reasons, the integration of the Dundee college was never satisfactorily achieved, 'not least in the field of Education. A separate Local Committee had been established in 1900 with a a lectureship independent of the Chair and any opportunity for Edgar himself was thus both delayed and diminished, especially as the first lecturer, Malloch, was a nationally recognised figure.⁶¹

In fact, Edgar had been selected in 1902 from a remarkably impressive academic field⁶² that had included not merely Clark, subsequently the Glasgow Lecturer, and Darroch, but also Adams who refused the post, much to the relief of his wife who had seen in it "enterrement de premiere classe".⁶³ However, apparently far from being grateful that he, a schoolmaster, had been appointed in preference to such an array of talent, he spent his first year in continual disputes with the Court over minor matters of prestige and payment which, it is clear, tried their patience.⁶⁴ No doubt as a result of such events, Edgar was not even appointed to the first Provincial Committee and when Malloch became their new Director of Studies, the initiative for filling the Dundee needs came not from the Professor but from the Principal of Dundee who suggested Edgar might do it on a part-time basis.⁶⁵ Given the small scale of his St. Andrews activities this did not seem unreasonable, but Edgar saw it as work requiring

both him and his Assistant who would both require further payment.⁶⁶ In 1909 he protested to the Court that his exclusion (clearly deliberate) from the Provincial Committee was damaging him professionally both in reputation and in his work.⁶⁷ Yet he continued to be passed over next year, even when a vacancy occurred.⁶⁸ In 1911, his Assistant having gone to a Canadian chair, he at first refused to work in Dundee until there was a replacement,⁶⁹ and subsequently, in 1916, it was discovered that in that year at any rate he was still being paid for Dundee lectures even though he had ceased to give them.⁷⁰ He seems to have played little or no part in the campaign for the degree, the Ordinance for which was designed by the Principal himself and it was not until July 1920 that he was finally appointed to the Provincial Committee,⁷¹ only having to withdraw a year later⁷² for the health reasons which always made him seen "frail" to Rusk. Thus by the time of his death in 1922, after twenty years in the chair, he had done little to expand its functions. He never activated the EdB Ordinance, never approached the Court for the necessary funds and only reluctantly taught in Dundee while he had done quite an amount of damage to the Chair's standing in the university. He was greatly respected by some of his students⁷³ and he employed enterprising Assistants who achieved considerable success outside Scotland⁷⁴ but his period in office seems to have hardly endeared him to his Senate colleagues.

Significantly his place on the Provincial Committee was taken by the new Principal Irvine himself,⁷⁵ a move which suggests a desire to take strong action in the matter of the St. Andrews arrangements over Education. Irvine had served on the Senate alongside Edgar for many years and as a Chemist under American influence, he appears to have shared much of the North American scientific departments' distaste for Education as an academic subject and he was later to try to dissuade the subsequent St. Andrews professor, Skinner, from post-graduate studies in Education in favour of a research career in Chemistry.⁷⁶ He soon made it clear that he had considerable changes in mind.

On May 29th 1922 at the same meeting of the Court at which Edgar's death was

curtly noted, he persuaded his colleagues to agree to the suspension of the Chair in favour of a much cheaper Lectureship and any members who had doubts about such a decision were hardly encouraged by the discovery at the following meeting that Rusk, then a lecturer at the Dundee College, had never been paid by Edgar during all the months that he had deputed for him during his last illness.⁷⁷

Naturally, the St. Andrews plan was not well received outside. In particular, Darroch and the National Committee pressed Irvine to reconsider⁷⁸ and it may well be that the advertisement for the new Lectureship produced something of a Scottish boycott on applications, for only Rusk, the *locum tenens*, appears to have applied.⁷⁹ The biggest protest naturally came from the EIS pursuing as ever their campaigns in Glasgow and Aberdeen and they received a further shock when in March 1923, the Court sent to the General Council a new set of proposed Arts regulations omitting Education completely from the structure of the MA degree.⁸⁰

This development was not in itself unexpected. At Edinburgh also, there had been moves to abandon the MA course⁸¹ in favour of one designed specifically for the Diploma and Darroch himself seemed quite willing to pay this "penalty ... for the increased emphasis laid upon professional studies"⁸² (despite equally fervent EIS protests) for in Edinburgh it had to be seen in the context of the new Education degree and all the hopes for its large scale development. In St. Andrews, on the other hand, nothing was being done even to implement the Diploma stage of the new degree and it seemed clear to many that Irvine's real intention was to abolish Educational Studies altogether. This was certainly the impression of Rusk who was first informed of the cancelling of all classes in the 1923-24 session by a notice pinned to his own classroom door.⁸³

The crisis, however, concerned more than the future of the Chair or even of Educational Studies at St. Andrews. The National Committee was disturbed by the general situation in Dundee. There a magnificent new training centre designed for 300

had attracted less than half that number, a shortfall not entirely explained by any shortage of posts for its subsequent products. Its possible closure was being openly canvassed on the grounds of its non-viability, though, as one paper commented, it would have been just as logical to close St. Andrews University on the same grounds.⁸⁴ Moreover, the press reported rumours of an importation of English recruits to take up vacant college and school places, an idea deplored by Darroch who reminded the official audience at the opening of the Dundee centre that "if any students were sent north, the English colleges would see that it was the worst and not the best that came. Speaking frankly," he said, "Scottish teachers do not want these people", and declared that the ultimate effect would be to keep down Scottish teachers' salaries so that, as a result, even fewer Scots candidates would be attracted to the universities and colleges.⁸⁵

When the time came for Struthers to hand over to his deputy, Macdonald, all talk in the National Committee was therefore of economies or even closure at Dundee⁸⁶ rather than of any import of candidates from other parts of Britain. A closer than usual scrutiny of the whole St. Andrews/Dundee situation was therefore undertaken by both Darroch's Committee and the SED,⁸⁷ while Irvine and his colleagues took more seriously the possibility of greater St. Andrews' involvement in the teaching of Education at Dundee, a matter hitherto left to the University College and Edgar's own personal arrangement (or non-arrangement) of assistance.

The most crucial scrutiny of all, however, came from the EIS who decided to seek Counsel's opinion on whether the University could set aside so easily their commitment to the Bell Trustees and after making their own legal enquiries, a University Committee in November 1923 was forced to accept that "as things now stand, the Court is legally bound to appoint a full Professor of Education". The reasons were complex, both legally and financially but none the less binding. The EIS took their victory calmly merely "receiving a report on the matter".⁸⁸

It is possible to exaggerate the actual local stir these events caused. Knox, in his account of the Chair, covers the whole matter in one sentence⁸⁹ and Cant, an historian always with an eye to the colourful story, ignores the whole affair completely in his history of the University, though Rusk's own description and the minutes of the Court and National Committee make it entertaining enough. The real stir came at a national level for the upshot was that the post of Director of Studies for the Provincial Committee (and thus the headship of the new Centre) was now to be joined to that of a resuscitated St. Andrews chair, thus causing something of a revolution in attitudes to the University/College relationship.

No documents appear to be extant indicating the origin of the proposal. Some believed that such a possibility had been envisaged in 1905.⁹⁰ Certainly, the negotiations were complicated during 1923 by the severe illness of Darroch and by Rusk's removal to Jordanhill in Glasgow, an unsuccessful attempt on his part, perhaps, to bluff St. Andrews into making his temporary post more permanent and his salary larger. By the end of October, the National Committee now acutely worried about the Dundee centre's future, officially proposed a joint appointment to the St. Andrews chair and their own College's headship. How far this came as a surprise to Irvine and his colleagues who had still not officially agreed to fill the Chair and how far it represented the public fruits of private negotiation it is now impossible to judge. Nor is it clear what role Struthers' successor Macdonald and SED played in it. Certainly, quite apart from solving an immediate educational and political problem, the arrangement appeared to have much to commend it to government. It meant that in future at least part of the Director of Studies' salary would come from University funds. A hitherto independent centre of potential research and higher training would also fall partly into public hands and would now be overseen and developed by a Professor/Director of Studies partly dependent on the state for his salary. Thus SED might well be in a position to buy their research cheaply and also keep it under their eye, though there is no written evidence for such a view and little doubt that the

immediate, apparent saving of finance provided the greatest attraction. In addition, it meant that the prestige of a university chair would brush off on the threatened college and possibly attract so many fresh students that the capital investment need not after all be written off. The cost of teacher training in St. Andrews/Dundee was already the most expensive in Scotland⁹¹ and parliamentary pressure might be just as strong on that issue as any that the EIS defenders of the independence of the Chair could possibly muster.

The immediate advantages for the St. Andrews Court seemed equally obvious. In its report of February 1924 the sub-committee considering the matter recommended that the new professorial salary should be £500 whereas Edgar had been paid £700, though they were to insist that SED must not be a party to any formal agreement and that the Provincial Committee alone should be the other party in the enterprise with the SED *not* involved⁹² though this was mere face-saving for both parties welcomed HMI Smith's participation in drawing up the agreement, although it had to be "on the invitation of the Principal".⁹³

The National Committee's minutes suggest some difficulty over an apparent insistence by the Bell Trustees (eventually set aside on Counsel's advice) that the new Professor must live in St. Andrews,⁹⁴ but the Court minutes attach little importance to the issue.⁹⁵ Irvine was obviously totally committed to the plan and the joint appointment was proceeded with in the early part of 1925 even though the final financial details were still under discussion.⁹⁶ All this was clearly the best that could be made of the situation. Respectable precedents for such joint appointments could of course be found in the English University Day Training Colleges as well as in a number of universities elsewhere in the Empire,⁹⁷ as Darroch had pointed out to the National Committee.⁹⁸

Over the actual choice of Professor, the university seems to have exerted an appreciable influence. The procedures were remarkably elaborate and reflected the

desire of all parties to make sure that if a Scottish chair was to be paid for, it should be in the academic mainstream of the English-speaking countries with the assumption that the world's leading figures might be attracted to this new bumper double appointment incorporating one of the two oldest English-speaking chairs. Thirty-four possible candidates were placed on a short-list "compiled after an exhaustive survey of the position and consensus of working educationists in important posts in the universities of the UK, USA., Canada, Australia and New Zealand".⁹⁹ In the event, few if any of these far-flung "candidates" showed any interest and the final short-list of three consisted, somewhat ironically, of Laird, Edgar's old assistant, Bumpas Smith of Manchester and the hardly known McClelland, one of Darroch's first graduates on the new degree course. Of these three Laird, now Professor at McGill, withdrew¹⁰⁰ and the post, on being offered to Bumpas Smith, was declined.¹⁰¹ Thus the final appointee, McClelland, was very much a last choice, whose appointment to an earlier post as an Assistant in Aberdeen had even been in doubt while the appointment committee investigated "whether he had served in the Army or Navy during the War".¹⁰² In the event the Aberdeen Court had appointed him by the narrow margin of four votes to three¹⁰³ and the only real enthusiasm for his appointment to St. Andrews/Dundee seems to have come from SED who welcomed him as a "mathematician" (statistician) who would, they felt, would by definition be in touch with the latest American ideas.¹⁰⁴ In the event despite the inauspicious nature of his appointment, McClelland was probably the most successful of all the St. Andrews Professors, activating almost immediately the Diploma neglected by Edgar, achieving an international reputation as a pioneer of survey research, figuring on the world stage as leading figure in the New Education Fellowship and eventually organising and planning Scottish teacher training, first as the Chief Executive of the National Committee and, after retirement, as the long-standing chairman of an influential if frustrated Advisory Council committee.

What Darroch really felt about the St. Andrews arrangement is now difficult to judge. As we noted earlier, his passion for reaching a consensus and conclusion in

any committee work he was involved in often sometimes involved him also in sinking his own feelings.¹⁰⁵ Certainly the idea of closer cooperation between the Chair and the College was naturally one that appealed to him as his pre-war plans for an integrated Faculty made clear¹⁰⁶ and in his presentation of this St. Andrews/Dundee plan he emphasised how it might lead to "a high standard of efficiency as well as many economies".¹⁰⁷ On the other hand he cannot have been entirely happy with the notion of a Professor of Education being paid the greater part of his salary by a Provincial Committee that he increasingly saw as the tool of the SED. Whatever his feelings, however, he could reasonably defend this present arrangement as the only feasible way of preserving and developing a threatened Chair and a non-viable college.

In any case, he probably felt that the plan was very much an *ad hoc* one rather than a proposed national prototype. There was no reason to believe that the other three universities with more buoyant local colleges and many more students would go the same way, especially as the creation of chairs at Aberdeen and Glasgow to meet the needs of the new degree, still seemed increasingly likely. Already in Glasgow, as a result of Rusk's appearance, Boyd no longer combined College lecturing with his University duties and there appeared to be an increasing separation of the two institutions. Moreover, the possibility of the Dundee arrangement had only arisen because of the fortuitous occurrence of a vacancy at the College (following Malloch's appointment as the National Committee's executive officer) at a time when the Chair was also vacant. He was not, of course, to know that within a few months, at a time when Morgan of Moray House was reaching retirement, he would himself die thus creating the possibility of implementing a similar plan for the far more important Chair at Edinburgh.

In fact, his death was to be a sensational one, creating headlines even in the English newspapers. In September 1924, he went on holiday in Jura and on the 9th he disappeared, producing considerable press speculation, before his body was found

on the shore some ten days later.¹⁰⁸ Rumours of depression, suggesting suicide, were borne out by at least one colleague,¹⁰⁹ but his earlier serious illness provides, perhaps, an adequate explanation. The suddenness, however, prevented his arranging a successor in the way that Laurie had done. Rusk, for one, later claimed that he had been passed over, despite Darroch's private promises¹¹⁰ and Boyd also had cherished hopes.¹¹¹

The possibility of making a joint appointment, as at St. Andrews, had been drawn to the attention of the Edinburgh Senate by Morgan himself¹¹² some weeks before Bumpas-Smith and McClelland met the joint selection committee in St. Andrews.¹¹³ Such a proposal was very much in line with his perennial advocacy of the Columbia model for Edinburgh, though there, where both university department and college were relatively busy and buoyant, something rather more elaborate than a simple joint appointment might well be necessary. What might be needed now was not one chair but two, with both spreading their influence over the two institutions. In other ways, the plan seemed even more obvious a procedure than it had done in St. Andrews. In Edinburgh the two institutions were less than a mile apart, they already shared staff and membership of each other's committees and had embarked on a number of important joint ventures, such as the development of a research and teaching programme based on the new Moray House laboratory.

Public criticism of such a plan was relatively muted and there was little or no opposition in Court, Senate or Provincial Committee,¹¹⁴ though some educational journalists were less happy, especially once the idea of a second chair had disappeared from the plan. For example, the Scottish correspondent of the *Journal of Education*. "On an outside view, it would seem evident that the man who is responsible, directly or indirectly, for the work of a Training College of 600 students and the complex business of certification of all sorts of teachers, simply cannot find the time for original work and must perforce reduce his university duties to a more or less perfunctory delivering of lectures. The experiment will need close watching ..."¹¹⁵

It was clear that, unlike at Dundee, a high-level assistant would be required to share the burden and, in the event, any overall savings for SED in the case of Edinburgh were to prove illusory. The new professor received £1400 - £700 in each post - but a deputy was deemed necessary at a salary of £1,000 and the total expenditure, therefore, amounted to more than the £2,200 paid to the holders of the earlier posts (£1,200 to the Director of Studies and £1,000 to the Chair)¹¹⁶ and while the University saved £300, any advantages to government (now paying £500 extra) had to be measured in educational terms or in terms of extra control over the machinery of research and advanced training.

The agreement of the university was more understandable. Not only did they save a small amount, (enough to pay the salary of junior member of staff) they also placed much of the burden of future physical developments and the cost of new equipment on the Provincial Committee at little or no cost to themselves. In the early days they had seen the Chair as a possible attraction to the more ambitious recruits for the teaching profession. Now, however, most recruits were coming to university in any case and in 1925 government was to decree that all male teachers *must* graduate whether they liked it or not. Thus a major advantage in housing the Chair seemed to have faded while the numbers attracted by the new degree were negligible. The natural home for a Professor of Education in many people's eyes seemed to be in a Training centre still totally dominated by the university's own graduates. Indeed it accorded with both English and American norms and it did perhaps give extra pleasure to those involved that in thus dispensing of a redundant asset, they could talk of building "one great school of education" for Scotland's capital, a rhetoric much indulged in by Drever who saw in the joint appointment the final American-style integration envisaged in the, to him, false dawn of 1905-06.¹¹⁷ The presence of the Professor of Education at the head of the College must surely clinch the links between University and Training Centre in a way that the rather different and more bureaucratic arrangements of the Provincial Committees had failed to do and numerous writers

including Thomson were often inaccurately to refer to Moray House in the future as the Teachers College of Edinburgh University¹¹⁸ and eventually a joint prospectus for "Edinburgh Provincial Training College and the Department of Education, Edinburgh University" was published by the National Committee as "approved by the Scottish Education Department".¹¹⁹

Yet from the beginning of the negotiations when the second chair was still a live issue, total integration of the Edinburgh Education Department and the College was never envisaged - just as there inevitably remained something of a division between the Professor's duties in St. Andrews and those in the Dundee College - and in February and March, the National Committee could still talk of the Edinburgh Chair "organising the (separate) education courses in the college" while the Director of Studies, who they still thought might be a part-time second professor, could lecture in the university on Administration and Practice.¹²⁰ In April a special joint meeting discussed cost, the relevance of the St. Andrews model and the dangers to the University Department of being actually housed in a Training Centre¹²¹ - on this last point, Laurie's doubts were actually quoted -but in May/June agreement was reached¹²² and by the end of July, Godfrey Thomson Professor of Education at Armstrong College in the University of Durham had been selected from a field of four drawn up a month earlier,¹²³ details of which do not appear in the minutes of either the University or the National/Provincial Committees.

In selecting Thomson, they were perhaps, quite apart from recognising his personal qualities, acknowledging the strength of the English Day Training model in this Scottish debate, for he was already holding just such a joint appointment at Newcastle, albeit in a university college with far fewer students and a tradition of educational studies far less distinguished and complex than that of Edinburgh in particular and Scotland in general. The SED in a Blue Book welcome specifically hoped for much from "the criticism which his English and American experience will enable him to apply to the Scottish system", admitting that "however good our

conceit of ourselves, we are not above taking lessons from England and America". They welcomed also the fact that he also was a "mathematician" like McClelland and that as a result of their appointments "important developments in Education may be expected ... the tide is strongly in the direction of experiment and statistics". This appointment was "a fresh tribute to the ascendancy which mathematics has recently established, or recovered."¹²⁴

The fulsome nature of these sentiments raises the question of how far Smith their author, was involved in the final selection at Edinburgh, if not at St. Andrews (where McClelland only crept in by the skin of his teeth) and how far SED now saw the Chairs as playing a useful role in advising government over such matters as secondary selection and administrative "efficiency", in contrast to the local administrators who, at least in the early 1920s, still looked to Plato for guidance.¹²⁵ In his report for 1924-26 Smith ignores the death of Darroch¹²⁶ but praises Morgan who more than anyone was always calling for a Professor of Educational Administration in an Edinburgh "Faculty".¹²⁷

Having thus disposed satisfactorily of the two chairs, the National Committee (and the SED?) now turned their attention to Aberdeen where, it was generally assumed, a Chair would shortly be established. The Carnegie trustees had apparently already donated a considerable sum towards the endowment of such a Chair¹²⁸ and the university was actively pursuing ways of augmenting it, as their acceptance in principle of a whole "Faculty" both during their degree negotiations and subsequently had demonstrated. On the same day that the drawing up of the Edinburgh short list was reported to the National Committee (24 Jun 1925) it also heard a proposal to coordinate Aberdeen's arrangement on St. Andrews/Edinburgh lines following Clarke's impending retirement from the post of University Lecturer in Education. However, Aberdeen's own Provincial Committee did not prove so enthusiastic.¹²⁹ They and the University were anxious to gain the National Committee's support in establishing a chair, for their reputation as a university specialising in the production of teachers

was still a live one¹³⁰ but were not so keen that the post of Director of Studies (not immediately vacant in their case) should be combined with it. It may be that they feared being put in the embarrassing position of having to accept the incumbent Director as the first Professor or it may be that they actually mistrusted the earlier joint appointment model. A strong campaign was conducted against the idea, with pertinent financial arguments being placed in the *Aberdeen University Review*.¹³¹ In the end the negotiations petered out in an abortive search for an extra augmentation of the Chair endowment of some £6-7,000. The SED, when approached claimed that the provision of such an augmentation was beyond their legal powers¹³² and the campaign lost its impetus. An anonymous suggestion (by Boyd?) in the *Journal of Education*¹³³ that the EIS should break into their strike funds to provide the necessary funds, got nowhere. Walker, an early Glasgow EdB, who had been appointed *interim* lecturer in the University following Clarke's retirement, finally became established Lecturer and although there continued to be interchange of staff between the college and university elsewhere, (including duties in the College for Walker himself) the University Education Department and the Provincial Training Centre remained entirely separate. Total integration had never been favoured locally and the integration of a mere low status Lectureship may not have had the same appeal for the College sector that the Chairs had had elsewhere.

Nor was there any attempt at integration in Glasgow where, despite student numbers comparable to those of Edinburgh, steps were still not taken to establish any Chair. Unlike in Edinburgh, the physical distance of Jordanhill from the University acted as a continuing disincentive to any integration as witnesses were subsequently to make clear in evidence to McClelland's wartime committee.¹³⁴ In addition, of course, there was no coincidence of vacancies as had happened elsewhere, so that no favourable moment arose for opening up such a question. As a result neither Boyd, the Glasgow Court nor the Provincial Committee made any move and while Boyd could never be accused of adopting a socially condescending attitude to the tasks and

students of the Colleges, he often made clear how much he valued separation from what to him was their pettifogging atmosphere and the results of too much control by the state.¹³⁵

For him, for Thomson and, on a smaller scale, for Walker, the major task during the remainder of the 20s and the 30s was the teaching of Diploma and Degree students. At Glasgow, Education remained a subject of the MA but as often as not now that subsequent or concurrent training was compulsory for all, that course was probably taken with the Diploma or Degree in mind for it was possible to earn credit for part of the post-graduate awards while still an undergraduate and many undergoing concurrent training could earn most of the diploma before actually graduating.¹³⁶

However, as usual in the Scottish University Departments, the strength of a teacher's personality could be crucial in the build-up or decline of a department, and until the 1950s recruitment for both Diploma and Degree at Glasgow and Edinburgh far outstripped that in Aberdeen and St. Andrews. This trend, of course, reflects in part the larger size and resources of the two central universities, but size was not necessarily such a decisive factor, as the later decline of Edinburgh and the post-war rise of Aberdeen under the same head of Department was to show. Instead, major figures such as Boyd and Thomson often had an influence independent of, perhaps in spite of the large universities that both employed them and undervalued their internationally known work. Despite the size of his classes, his work in the clinic which he had founded and his often lonely pioneering of research among teachers, Boyd received from Glasgow University in 1930 a salary which was only half of that given to McClelland who taught for no degree and had fewer graduate students in his whole Training College than there were in Boyd's Diploma classes. He also received less than half of that accorded to Thomson who usually delegated his daily non-University work to the Depute Director of Studies, who was also paid more than Boyd.¹³⁷

It is doubtful, however, if Boyd felt too much of a grievance over his personal finances. Certainly there is no evidence in the Court minutes of those squabbles over small sums that typified the Meiklejohn and Edgar periods at St. Andrews. His quarrels with the Court and Senate tended to be over his views on the ideal form of university involvement in undergraduate teacher-training and over whether Glasgow should have a Chair, a Chair which he wished to help finance by his own efforts at test-construction.¹³⁸ He appears to have actually submitted such a plan only to have it rejected out of hand without even a committee being set up to investigate it.¹³⁹

Boyd frankly acknowledges his bitterness over not being given a chair.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, he disarmingly admits that he had entered the University Education Department with such a chair in mind. The idea had first occurred to him on reading the short list for Meiklejohn's Chair in the *Blairgowrie Advertiser* 'When I saw this, my immediate reaction was: "I'm as good a man as any of these. Some day I will have a go at such a post."' ¹⁴¹ and the bitterness of his frustration was added to by the fact that Glasgow University continued to refuse even when money appeared to be freely available. In his *Journal of Education* column in June 1925 he claimed that the University had received over £1,000,000 from "citizens and graduates" for bursaries, scholarships and the endowment of "nearly a score of new chairs" and he expected Education would soon follow Accountancy, recently endowed with a gift of £20,000, but later he was to see a possible source of its financing, a bequest from a Lord Provost, diverted to Engineering. As Boyd recognised, the trouble was that everybody thought the endowment of Education "was the business of the state".¹⁴²

At the same time, it has to be admitted that the Court regularly recorded their indebtedness to him¹⁴³ both for founding and maintaining the Clinic and for maintaining a long and highly successful series of Saturday lectures for serving teachers on "Contemporary Issues"¹⁴⁴ which were fully reported in the *Glasgow Herald*. Unlike Thomson in Edinburgh he was politically astute enough to draw the Court's attention to every public event that might increase his Department's standing

in the eyes of the university establishment, but unlike Thomson, he needed to do such things.

Almost from his arrival as lecturer in 1909 and despite his great academic achievements, Boyd had been as unpopular in some quarters as he was popular in others. He seems regularly to have chosen to court controversy even in quarters where he might well have sought allies. When he addressed the University Fabian Society for the first time, on "Socialism and Liberty", he "explained his views anent the ethical inter-relationship of the individual and the State, illustrating his deductions by a criticism of the Right to Work Bill of the Labour Party" expressing views that were "sufficiently heterodox to provoke an animated and alienating discussion".¹⁴⁵ As Inglis indicated in an obituary, Boyd was "never a man to keep to the safe havens of orthodoxy".¹⁴⁶ He claimed that "if you are a Glaswegian your morals are just as good as your accent".¹⁴⁷ He began with a working class Ayrshire accent, moderately broad, but was said to have exaggerated it in order to demonstrate his solidarity with the Clydeside working class though at least one person who knew him well saw this as an act designed to embarrass his younger brother Sir John Boyd who was both more serious-minded and far more publicly committed to socialism.¹⁴⁸ He was also supposed to have acquired a vaguely Marxist reputation as a result of his work for the Labour Party and among the unemployed of Clydebank¹⁴⁹ though, unlike A.S.Neill, he seems to have distanced himself from the Scottish Socialist Teachers Society which was centred in Glasgow.¹⁵⁰

No doubt he alienated other colleagues, at a time when university affairs were publicly conducted with the utmost seriousness, by what they took to be his flippancy¹⁵¹ while he and Rusk, in their public life, in their exposition of Rousseau and experimental education, could sometimes owe as much to the traditions of the Scottish Music Hall as to those of Jena or Columbia carrying the couthy humour already displayed by Laurie, Adams and Darroch¹⁵² to new extremes. Rusk, for example, seems to have warmed up at least one lecture audience with community

singing¹⁵³ while Ballard, speaking of an examinations conference in Folkestone, noted that while "breeziness is not as a rule a marked characteristic of these learned conferences, ... Boyd of Glasgow supplied us with a welcome whiff".¹⁵⁴ Boyd began one Jordanhill lecture, "When I was last in Barlinnie"¹⁵⁵ and, introducing a book by an ex-student, he opined that "the man who can begin a book concerning schools with a story about a bus-conductress has no need for anyone to write a foreword for him".¹⁵⁶

Boyd thus bore a reputation as an entertainer that for some people, disguised or even belied his academic stature and ideological commitment though it could work the opposite way. He himself claimed that it was his own light-hearted behaviour at a Conference in Elsinore, dressing in a borrowed lady's kilt and proposing a toast with one foot on the table that had created those friendships with Americans which first led to his many visiting professorships in North America and in other parts of the Empire.¹⁵⁷ Russell, in a memoir of Boyd as he was in the '20s, recalls him as the "most entertaining lecturer by far; his weekly 'heckling meeting' was a riot."¹⁵⁸ Such "disputatious" classes were not new in either Scotland or Glasgow. They were apparently a feature of Laurie's teaching, though he still seems to have preserved the shape of each lecture sufficiently for his son to deputise for him when he was ill.¹⁵⁹ His immediate model, however, was probably his patron, Henry Jones, whose Moral Philosophy Class was "conducted on broad and disputatious lines".¹⁶⁰ However, "the general feeling was that his manner was considered 'common' and that political prejudice was at work to prevent his being promoted Professor, as he most certainly deserved for his writings and ability alike".¹⁶¹ He certainly rejected the usual habit (maintained by Drever) of dictating lectures to a captive audience. According to Miss Macallister he dictated two sentences and then spoke freely.¹⁶²

Even so, whatever his style, his educational views in themselves were often unacceptable to the conservative academics who controlled his finances even though, he always claimed, his were *practical* views based on a long, direct experience of

working in secondary schools.¹⁶³ At the same Folkestone conference, not content with declaring himself a total "anti-examinationist" he claimed that he never went through any "degree examination without feeling a charlatan ... I know these degree marks do not really mean what they are supposed to mean ..." ¹⁶⁴ even now not necessarily a popular sentiment not only in the Glasgow Senate but also in the Senates of Edinburgh, Durham and Sheffield, all of which, he claimed, had refused him a chair.¹⁶⁵ Nor did he fit the bill of those left-wingers who expected his unorthodox opinions to fall neatly into the patterns and campaign literature of current crusades and recruiting drives. Inglis justifiably points out that despite his passion for the "new" education "he made no attempt to form new orthodoxies by any process of indoctrination and indeed he would have felt that he had failed if he had established a like-minded group who accepted all his judgments. He wanted to be Socrates ..." ¹⁶⁶ rather than a political leader. He was a keen member of the Ayrshire Labour Party and regularly appointed to Ayrshire Education Committee¹⁶⁷ but was finally to be rejected by them for not accepting what to them were politically necessary compromises over the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.¹⁶⁸

Potential academic supporters mistrusted the dilettantism (generalism to his friends) that took him, a science teacher, into philosophy, the history of ideas, institutional history, psychology and mental testing. He saw himself in the tradition of Laurie and of German pedagogy but in an increasingly specialist Glasgow University such a dispersal of effort smacked more and more of dabbling.

Even so, his classes¹⁶⁹ and clinic were highly successful and influential and his books sold (and sell), like those of Rusk, in very great numbers.¹⁷⁰ He was a dominant figure in the EIS during the '20s restoring the close links with academia that had existed in the '70s and '80s but had declined with the disappearance of figures such as Hodgson and Donaldson. As President in 1921 he addressed meetings in every part of the country, "dealing with a great variety of topics".¹⁷¹ He was also an equally welcome guest outside Scotland, not just at English conferences, but as a visiting

professor and as a leading figure in the New Education Fellowship whose world conference in Scotland was hosted by him, assisted by McClelland.¹⁷²

Many of Boyd's views now seem, to many, to say the least, old-fashioned. As he himself said, he was always rejected as non-progressive by those "obsessed with a psycho-analytical view".¹⁷³ He believed, for example, that teachers should marry teachers and devote their whole lives to nurturing educational values almost in the style of a religious order.¹⁷⁴ He believed in the conventional way of the time that professional people "had to be masters of a mystery – some special knowledge or skill that ordinary folk do not possess and that they recognise in its possessors".¹⁷⁵ Moreover, and this could not have pleased Rusk, he made it clear that for the professional teacher a training college "is not good enough". He "must have the university stamp".¹⁷⁶ He abhorred even the comparatively mildly permissive sexual mores of the American colleges of sixty years ago;¹⁷⁷ and he could even be academically snobbish about the quality of Glasgow theses compared with those of the United States though he found the best of the American studies "less pot-bound, with more promise of later blossom".¹⁷⁸ It is, however, unreasonable to expect any man to escape entirely from the attitudes of his period (Drever, the great populariser of modern psychology and admirer of Freud could still see grave harm in masturbation as late as the 1930s).¹⁷⁹ On balance, Boyd had a liberating effect on Scottish educational thinking and even his (by modern standards) not very sophisticated excursions into the field of test construction were still a revelation and a break-through in the all too easily narrow world of West of Scotland teaching. Moreover, it was his enthusiasm for such forms of research that led him to found the EIS Research Committee.

This committee met for the first time in November 1919 under Boyd's chairmanship with the simple aims of stimulating an interest in research among teachers,¹⁸⁰ offering guidance to teachers undertaking research¹⁸¹ and, possibly, "initiating one or two lines of research work".¹⁸² Over the next ten years, chiefly

through Boyd's own enthusiasm it embarked on a series of more and more ambitious, mainly testing projects culminating in plans for an Intelligence Test to be used at the Leaving Certificate stage.¹⁸³ Much of the statistical approach was crude compared with that of Moray House and, noticeably, attendance by Edinburgh members such as Drever and McClelland began to fall off; but in the end it was this Committee, in conjunction with the Association of Directors of Education, that in December 1927 launched the Scottish Council for Research in Education, the first of its kind in the British Isles,¹⁸⁴ which was, according to Rusk (its first Director),¹⁸⁵ the only place where the Heads of the University Education and Psychology Departments regularly met before the institution of the Burn Conference in the 1960s. Boyd felt that the part that he played in the Council's establishment was never fully recognised,¹⁸⁶ particularly by SED whose leaders only began publicly to recognise the value of Scotland's "pioneering fundamental research on the learning process and the measurement of intelligence" after he was dead.¹⁸⁷

Like Knight, working in Aberdeen, Boyd tried to persuade practising teachers to set aside their old prejudices against "theory" in order to discover, as the Aberdeen EIS put it, that "the discoveries which scientific investigation has made can lead to more satisfying and more satisfactory work for both pupil and teacher".¹⁸⁸ Thus when Boyd talked in the '20s to large groups of teachers, voluntarily giving up their Saturday mornings, about "modern education" he provided more than Neill's vague generalisations about general approaches to children and, indeed, disproved the latter's later claims that no Scottish audience would be interested in such a topic.¹⁸⁹ He dealt specifically with modern approaches to the actual difficulties of teaching the three Rs and producing not merely imaginative but accurate composition and, in his research, gave the lie to Warburton's claim that British research has not on the whole been concerned with school subjects.¹⁹⁰ D. Hamilton has posed the question of whether figures such as Neill should "receive so much more attention than Findlay, Adams and Boyd ... (who also) discussed such concepts as freedom, interest, play and

growth, yet, at the same time, ... also struggled with equally pertinent questions about social structure and social efficiency".¹⁹¹ Certainly Boyd himself had a view of Neill that seemed to suggest concern that he was getting the "new education" an unfortunate reputation for unreality and unreliability.¹⁹² The devotion of both Boyd and McClelland to the New Education Fellowship acts as a reminder that it was by no means dominated by revolutionary figures such as Neill but also included among its supporters Burt, Nunn, Piaget and Fred Clarke,¹⁹³ all of them concerned with the scientific approach to practical problems.

This approach certainly underlay Boyd's whole conception of his Clinic which, unlike Drever's, attempted to provide specifically educational solutions to learning difficulties in school, rather than therapy of a more general kind. Whereas Drever's initial remit was to examine juvenile delinquency, Boyd was more interested in numeracy and literacy and provided a general service for Glasgow for a whole decade before a full-time clinic was provided by the education authority.¹⁹⁴ His emphasis and the availability of the Degree were two of the factors which led the educational psychology service of Scotland to emphasise the recruitment not of mere qualified psychologists but of qualified teachers who were also qualified psychologists. He was often to attack the English tendency to turn too readily to psychiatrists when tackling an individual child's problems.¹⁹⁵

Despite his difficulties and failure to achieve a chair, Boyd's position and the position of his department when he retired in 1946 was a relatively secure one. He was made a Reader and feted as a great eccentric who like so many others had achieved respectability among his colleagues simply by his survival as much as by his public fame, even though one of his last and typical acts was to give evidence to McClelland's Teacher Training Enquiry that was diametrically opposed to that of Glasgow University as such.¹⁹⁶

Walker in Aberdeen, lacking Boyd's personality and firm University appointment

involving no College duties, had to tread more carefully. He had many College duties and for the first few years his Lectureship remained "interim". Ostensibly this was because the Court still cherished the hope of a Chair, or even the incorporation of the Training Centre into a new Faculty.¹⁹⁷

In the end, however, as the prospect of a Chair faded, Walker was at least able to have his post confirmed,¹⁹⁸ to develop the Diploma and to produce a small but steady trickle of EdBs in a way that was still impossible for McClelland despite his grander title. There can, of course, be no doubt of the latter's ability both as a teacher and researcher and, to his credit, he rescued both the St. Andrews chair and the Dundee College from the threat of destruction surrounding them when he took office, as Rusk was prepared to admit.¹⁹⁹ Moreover, he eventually managed to establish the Diploma in 1928 in the hope that the Degree might follow²⁰⁰ but there can be equally no doubt that his main contribution to Scottish education lay outside his University Department. He had already pioneered local administration in Wigtown before being brought back into academic life by Darroch and his survey work for the Scottish Council for Research in Education, his work on test construction, his enthusiastic role in the New Education Fellowship, his subsequent work as a national officer in the field of teacher training and his chairmanship of the wartime Advisory Council enquiries into the future of the teaching profession all made him a well known figure both nationally and internationally. As far as his university work in St. Andrews and Dundee is concerned, little evidence remains though some of his students in their responses to BQ mention the close interest he took in them as individuals, while his relief work among the unemployed in Dundee paralleled but has become less celebrated than that of Boyd in Clydebank. Young who joined him in Dundee from Thomson's staff in Edinburgh, confirmed that the latter had less enthusiasm for his College duties than McClelland.²⁰¹ His fellow College Principal, Wood, sees him as the chief architect of the system of independent Colleges of Education that eventually emerged in the 1950s²⁰² but it was not he but his successor Skinner that finally launched the Degree

programme in 1948.

In Edinburgh, on the other hand, degree-holders could by that time be counted in hundreds and the quarter century during which Thomson held his joint appointment was to be regarded by many as something of a Golden Age. Certainly, as at Glasgow, a large number of successful graduates were produced though (see chapters 8 and 9 below) some of that success must be attributed to Drever, his partner in the teaching and administration of the degree. Certainly also, Thomson achieved success of his own, not merely as a teacher/author and as a psychologist/statistician but also as the head of a business venture supplying tests for secondary school selection to a majority of the local authorities throughout the United Kingdom. But as with all Golden Ages, some reexamination is necessary not merely of Thomson's graduate production (the subject of later chapters) and of his academic nature and reputation but also of his attitudes, success and position as a Professor of Education in Scotland.²⁰³ There can be little doubt of the influence of Thomson in the development of British mental testing. Knight for example linked him with Ballard, Burt and Spearman as the four British "psychologists who have done at least as much as any others to establish principles",²⁰⁴ though Thomson himself was always the first to accord precedence (probably rightly) to Burt.²⁰⁵

Because of his concern with the statistical aspects of testing Thomson was certainly known in North America. In Sandiford's 1928 study of World Educational Psychology, for example, his is the only name in the index with any Scottish connection²⁰⁶ and Rugg also links his name with the great American figures as one of "the more competent statistical workers of the first generation alongside Thurstone and Spearman, among others".²⁰⁷ Even so, Barnard in his 1961 examination of mental testing in Britain does not pick him out for special mention alongside Burt and his London colleagues²⁰⁸ while numerous American standard texts on mental testing and the history of psychology either make no mention of him or merely note him in some footnote, normally in connection with some technical statistical point.²⁰⁹ To some

extent this reflects the academic chauvinism which, according to Brehaut all too often marred the work of many American academics in the post-war period²¹⁰ but such apparent neglect is to be found also in significant non-Edinburgh Scottish work produced in Thomson's heyday, for example in a long monograph by Boyd's student, Alexander, produced in 1954,²¹¹ where again Thomson's work is hardly a central reference even when Analysis of Variance is the leading technique at issue. Indeed, it may be that a growing enthusiasm for the use of the latter and of Factor Analysis is one of the reasons for the recent increasing interest in Thomson shown by historians of the social sciences, though most surprising of all, perhaps, Thomson's name does not appear in the index of Mackenzie's *Statistics in Britain 1865-1930* (1981) which was actually published by Edinburgh University Press.

On the other hand, a more obvious reason for Thomson's fame (notoriety?) is as a founding father of secondary school selection procedures and, in particular, of the English 11+. Yet, in fact, Vernon in his key survey published in 1957 mentions Boyd alongside Thomson as a pioneer of such techniques,²¹² and, indeed Boyd mentions how he had commended the Scottish system of secondary selection by testing to audiences in the United States²¹³ and saw such testing as a way of increasing the teacher's professional efficiency.²¹⁴ Burt's early London trials were probably both more influential and more sophisticated than Thomson's now celebrated experiment in Northumberland. Even so, the commercial success of the Moray House Tests and the fact that such a high proportion of British children were subjected to them²¹⁵ has naturally led those distant from his Scottish work to see him not merely as the leading technical developer of such tests but, in a certain sense, their ideologue. Moreover, it now seems difficult for many writers to see the 11+ as anything but an evil even though, as Kellaghan has pointed out,²¹⁶ there is still little hard evidence regarding its actual detrimental effects even on the curriculum of feeder primary schools. Thus, despite his own efforts to make it clear that selection was merely a necessary evil, that he was opposed to streaming²¹⁷ and that his attempts to develop

increasingly efficient selection procedures was simply an attempt to make things fairer for the working class child in an otherwise unfair world,²¹⁸ this very striving for efficiency has made his work seem heartless and mechanical. Rusk attacked him for that and Simon has rightly criticised the over-confidence that sometimes marked his popular presentation of the case for Moray House testing.²¹⁹

The best comment on Thomson's predicament is perhaps that of Sharp who feels that "the problem facing (him) ... was essentially that while his educational philosophy was free to be considerably ahead of his time, his contribution to testing as a part of selection was not, and the latter as a result had consequences other than those which he envisaged. It is a problem which may arise whenever work of considerable applied potential is being used in a context over which the originator has no control".²²⁰

Thomson has thus been cast unfairly in the role of an authoritarian believer in a Platonic system of rigorous academic selection, a pillar of the right, a supporter even of eugenic manipulation. There is however only slight and superficial evidence to support such stereotypical analysis. True, his personal copy of *Mein Kampf*²²¹ shows an especial underlining of passages dealing with the mandarin selection of the German civil service, but this simply accords with his lifelong admiration (shared with the distinctly non-Fascist Rusk) for German training procedures²²² and there appears to be no evidence that he ever demonstrated his approval of the openly pro-Hitler activities carried on in the local branch of the Link by a number of Edinburgh academics, notably Laurie's son, the Principal of Heriot-Watt, who published an English tribute to Hitler from Berlin as late as the summer of 1939.²²³ Indeed, the personal evidence of his many Scottish admirers suggests on the contrary a kindly personality of great sensitivity. Perhaps more overtly authoritarian were his enthusiastic "nineteen years service in Volunteer and Territorial Forces" (his own phrase in *Who's Who*) that had led him to combine being Professor in Newcastle with the command of the Durham University Officers Training Corps.²²⁴ But such military displays were common enough among academics in the early part of the century, especially in

Scotland where Principals could even appear at academic ceremonies in military uniform.²²⁵ Indeed, this military enthusiasm may have helped in his selection (given McClelland's difficulties at Aberdeen noted earlier) though his statistics and his American experience as well as his knowledge of the Newcastle joint university/college system probably counted for more, as we noted earlier.

In fact there is far stronger evidence to gainsay the stereotyping. He certainly was no committed social engineer and, as he himself said, he did "not march in the ranks of the out-and-out behaviourists". All that he urged was that "a great deal of pruning with the Behaviourist bill-hook would be of advantage to the health of the psychological tree of knowledge".²²⁶ His early reputation, as Jenny Lee makes clear, was as an innovator showing little respect for the commonly authoritarian style of the university teacher. He may not have emulated Boyd's "heckling meeting" or Rusk's community singing but on occasions he did appear wearing a gown over tennis clothes,²²⁷ he did disarmingly forecast when a lecture was going to be bad²²⁸ and even on one occasion provoked a student strike, by unsuccessfully attempting to substitute open seminars for weekly bouts of traditional note-taking²²⁹ though the tutorials he did eventually establish in the degree class were often, according to Lumsden, quite solemn and formal affairs.²³⁰ According to Semeonoff, interruptions (unwontedly in Scotland) were welcomed²³¹ but he always felt that Thomson was more interested in research than teaching. However, he seems to have continued informal in his attitude to degree regulations, admitting promising part-timers when they were expressly forbidden by the rules.²³² He was impressively self-effacing with his own staff, insisting on sitting in at their philosophy lectures while "learning the game" and then being critically observed by the same colleagues while trying his own hand.²³³ Indeed, he was almost obsessively concerned with giving credit to others,²³⁴ as well as doubting the worth of much of his own apparent achievement as well as that of Psychology in general.²³⁵

Moreover, whatever his eventual fame in the field of Psychometrics and Mental

Testing he did not introduce such subjects either to Scotland or to Edinburgh. They had already been long established by Drever and Darroch²³⁶ who had even attracted a researcher in such subjects from Australia²³⁷ and the Moray House Laboratory was already a well-known institution throughout the British Isles. Despite the fact that he had already introduced such studies in Newcastle and had published a book on statistics for beginners²³⁸ it was not until the academic year 1929-30 that he began teaching such subjects in Edinburgh. Moreover, in his later years he gave up lecturing on them to the Diploma class and Reith, as a Degree student, gained the impression that by that time his interests lay in Philosophy rather than Testing.²³⁹

So far as the University Education Department was concerned, Thomson took it on as a going concern and apart from expanding the work of test construction did not greatly alter the pattern of its activities from what they had been under Darroch. Indeed, this was to be a cause of some concern, for although the number of Degree students increased, particularly in the years immediately following the second war, the syllabus and general structure of the Diploma and Degree, as well as the setting, remained largely unchanged. According to Inglis, his deputy, he had for long opted for research rather than administration,²⁴⁰ something that the physical distancing of his headquarters from the Old Quad allowed him to do more easily. and once Inglis had accepted responsibility for the College administration, there was in the University Department something of an administrative vacuum. He had, says Inglis, a hatred, disconcerting in an administrator, of attending routine meetings and was delighted, on finding two scheduled for the same day, to play one off against the other.²⁴¹ The result was that Thomson eventually found himself, in a pre-retirement crisis, having to appeal to the University to give "immediate consideration to the desirability of making more adequate and permanent provision for the conduct of research and teaching in (the) department".²⁴²

This appeal in fact constituted virtually the first major appearance of Thomson in either Senate or Court business since his appointment over twenty years earlier. Such

resource problems had largely arisen through his hitherto probably over-ready dependence on the Thomson Research Fund (the proceeds of his test sales) for a regular, quick solution to all his building and staffing problems and the Senate's anxiety that this should not continue was no doubt mingled with surprise, given the apparent post-war affluence of Moray House as an SED-supported institution bursting with students. Indeed, it was a typical manifestation of the way in which the operations of the joint appointment had separated both Chair and Department from the life of the university as a whole. Housed in Moray House and, (unlike Psychology) away from the Old Quad, they had grown away from the mainstream of university life. For example, because of the emphasis on his college appointment, Thomson, unlike Laurie and Darroch, had been almost entirely ignored by the university newspaper *Student*, which probably saw the 1925 moves less as the establishment of Drever's Columbia-style Teachers College than as the shedding of Education by the University. Certainly they took little notice of the event. Not until 1950 did he reappear in *Student's* pages, sponsoring a student competition (with prizes) as part of some research on teaching methods initiated by the Senate.²⁴³ Not surprisingly, in its farewell note on his retirement, *Student*, though acknowledging he was "always a leader in the field of Educational Psychology" principally noted that he "will best be remembered by second year students who were brave enough to submit themselves to one of his tests on first joining us".²⁴⁴

Otherwise Thomson's links with the remainder of the University were generally limited to serving on delegations or committees and giving the occasional address to graduates or distinguished guests.²⁴⁵ It was not surprising that the activities of Moray House, including the University department, were thus often seen as those of a quite separate institution. Thomson was never "one of the well-known faces in the Old Quad" as a student article had described Darroch.²⁴⁶ For one thing, he travelled extensively with many interests and commitments outwith Scotland,²⁴⁷ most notably in North America, where he was a member of the Thorndike circle.²⁴⁸

Boyd, on the other hand, always remained a familiar face on Gilmorehill and because Education remained a subject in the MA, he continued to occupy a position within the core of the Faculty of Arts, unlike Thomson, who remained a marginal figure to Faculty and Senate except when his advice was needed over some new form of examination or selection procedure. Boyd also remained a popular and familiar figure in the local community and in the local profession, a position undoubtedly helped by the generally part-time nature of the Glasgow Degree class. In Edinburgh where students had to be full-time it was necessary to rely far more extensively on family wealth and rare government grants for financing this extra year, once Carnegie had refused to do so. This meant that a higher proportion of Edinburgh candidates came from England or from overseas than was usual in Glasgow. Given Boyd's popularity and the distance from the main College at Jordanhill, it was not surprising therefore that the Glasgow Department developed a distinct and widely recognised image of its own at a time when outsiders found it sometimes difficult to distinguish between the University and College sectors of Moray House and the development of such a separate image over three decades probably accounts in part for the comparatively stronger position of the Glasgow Department in the later part of the century.

The importance of physical separation from the College was appreciated in the Edinburgh Psychology Department which, though accepting its commitment to teachers and to the Education degree as its major concern (and for many years the only means by which it could produce Honours graduates), nevertheless developed other commitments in the Medical and Science Faculties that began to give it an image quite independent of Thomson's activities.²⁴⁹ Drever, in the first of two essays in autobiography, emphasised his debt to Laurie and Darroch and his commitment to Education²⁵⁰ but in the second emphasised his commitment also to industry and clinical medicine, mentioning his educational commitments reverently but more cursorily.²⁵¹

In the other universities also, Psychology developed considerably, headed in Glasgow after Watt's departure, first by Thouless and then by Philip Vernon, both national figures in their field and in Aberdeen by Rex Knight, also a key figure in British Psychological Society literature for over thirty years. In St. Andrews the integration of post-Stout Psychology into the Education syllabus began well with the Education-orientated Valentine who, immediately before the first war, launched American-style advanced education classes of a demanding kind not then found elsewhere in Britain,²⁵² but he was to be followed by the less educationally orientated figure of Oeser, who according to Seth²⁵³ did much to develop Experimental Psychology but also by his words and actions caused the department to be a centre of more general controversies on a number of occasions.²⁵⁴

Indeed Oeser's personal behaviour may in fact explain the difficulties of McClelland and later Skinner in developing a Degree programme, for elsewhere the enthusiasm for advanced studies came as much from and sometimes more from the Psychologists than from the Education Department itself. Indeed, the profession of Psychology, through the British Psychological Society, was to be the first to recognise the degree as a specific professional qualification and while it is true that that the profession of Psychology never attracted a majority of BEd/EdB graduates, the degree played a much more central role in that profession than in school-teaching or educational administration and this was particularly true during the inter-war and immediate post-war periods.²⁵⁵

Indeed, following the war, the increasing confidence and independence of Psychology was to pose major challenges to the idea of a common, generalist Education degree. Because of the expansion of research and a new professional, scientific rigour, at least some element of specialisation was to be demanded not only by the BPS but by Scottish professors, notably Drever *fills* who succeeded his father. In all this the American model was probably as potent as usual for there also, as Bailyn has noted, the contributory disciplines that were for long supposed to be

building up a coherent Education discipline in Columbia, Ann Arbor and elsewhere began either to lose interest in such issues or to grow apart as the more ambitious professors sought status for their brand of educational studies in the more specific and separated professional world of the individual disciplines themselves.²⁵⁶ The same gradually began to happen in Scotland. In the second of his Advisory Council reports (published in 1946) McClelland attempted to forestall a growing rift becoming more and more evident in the teaching of the Education degree and in teacher training generally.

"The remedy would appear to be to combine the separate courses into a single course in Educational Science, a science which has a field of its own but also draws freely upon the principles of many others ..."

but he was fighting a losing battle, advocating eclectic courses that were no longer viable. Thus, "Every teacher", he suggested, "should have a broad knowledge of Sociology. [Any extra course in it, however,] should be neither very detailed nor very academic ..."²⁵⁷ – a recommendation that was to prove impossible in the lavishly subsidised and increasingly research-minded and all too often careerist academic world that was about to develop and threaten what was more and more seen as the hopelessly dilettante approach of the Laurie-Darroch-Boyd tradition.

NOTES

1. Education Reform Committee Report (1917).
2. Roman (1930) p 94.
3. SED Report 1918-20 p 21.
4. The Blue Book had talked of Darroch's plan being "for the few", with only an "indirect" influence on the mass of teachers. SED Report 1912-13 p 44.
5. See for example Report on their Ayr Congress in *Journal of Education* Feb 1928. The idea was kept alive also in the student press e.g. in the *New Dominie* throughout 1936.
6. *Journal of Education* Aug 1922.
7. The first graduate, Aitken, had taken his MA as long ago as 1896.
8. St A C 12 Sep 1919.
9. In BQ interview.
10. Glas Education Board of Studies 2 Mar 1922. A year earlier (Glas Sen 3 Feb 1921) a suggestion of evening classes by the EIS was rejected by the Faculty of Arts on resource grounds though they did acknowledge "that it is important that the University should provide teaching on a high standard for the growing class of persons engaged in daily work who would gladly avail themselves of opportunities for advanced study..."
11. *New Era* Aug 1935 p 177.
12. Report of Board of Studies to Aber Sen 21 Sep 1920.
13. The classes for the degree were actually scheduled for the evening. "That was an exceptional course which it was not proposed to continue beyond the one or two years necessary to work off, so to speak, those who had never had the opportunity of studying for the new degree." *Aberdeen University Review* Nov 1920. But the arrangement was cancelled (Aber C 12 Jul 1921) when only six students indicated that they would attend.
14. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. This was an irregular series appearing during the late 1940s.
15. SED Report 1917-18 p 8.
16. SED Report 1918-20 p 6.
17. SED Report 1916-17 p 6. Though in fact, the drop in recruitment may in part have anticipated the post-war trend.
18. Noted retrospectively in SED Report 1918-20, which contained two reports in one.

19. *Ibid.*
20. Cruickshank (1970) p 167.
21. Peddie (1926) Appendix C p 1.
22. The influence of Carnegie in Scotland is largely unresearched but was obviously a key factor at this period.
23. Jones (1924) p 109. The SED Report for 1918-20 notes that in 1919-20 107 students attended University classes in Education out of a total of 1228, though this probably reflects the impact of the new Diploma requirements.
24. Cruickshank (1970) p 171. The quota (for Chapter III and IV trainees) was the result of teacher unemployment. The tide appears to have turned later in the 1930s when local authorities began to find it cheaper to take on non-graduate women. SED justified it on educational grounds saying that they had a more "professional" training, though Glasgow Provincial Committee still favoured graduation.
25. Drever, Darroch and Inglis had all been Assistants. Two of Edgar's Assistants Valentine and Laird were to go straight to chairs elsewhere.
26. For a national summary of these arrangements in the post-war period, see Jones (1924) p 109.
27. See, for example, Walker's request to the Aberdeen Court 14 May 1929.
28. Cruickshank (1970) p 164.
29. Laurie (1922).
30. SED 1918-20 Reports.
31. A line still being pursued in 1986. Humes (1986) pp 143-4.
32. SED Report 1928-30 p 5 "the Training Colleges and Universities are in some respects further apart today than they were in 1911".
33. SED Reports 1918-20.
34. Jones (1924) p 109.
35. SED Reports 1924-26.
36. Almost certainly written by Boyd, by then their Scottish correspondent. *Journal of Education* Dec 1919.
37. *Student* 24 Feb 1919.
38. Hendy (1920) p 10.
39. Peddie (1926) Appendix C. Peddie was executive officer of the

National Committee.

40. See chapter 9 below.

41. See chapter 5 above.

42. Drysdale's laboratory notes in *Experimental Education* for 17 Oct 1917, for example, begin with an experiment "to test mode of learning by the method of the coordination of hand and eye movement", followed by one "to test association of ideas" while *Experimental Psychology* notes for the 1919-20 and 1920-21 sessions made by her and Young include topics such as Rote Memory and the testing and examination of "affective experience".

43. BPS Minutes 30 Jan 1904.

44. BPS Minutes Dec 1906 & Jan 1907.

45. BPS 1914 Report.

46. BPS 1920 Report.

47. Letter from Drever in BPS Minutes 15 Dec 1923. Apart from himself and Young, most of the members were medical academics plus a Minister in Leith.

48. BPS Minutes 12 Mar 1931. This was a cause of particular bitterness as other distant members, including Spearman, had had their expenses paid. There may in this be discerned the scorn for Scottish activity later shown by Schonell.

49. At St. Andrews, Psychology was still firmly in the hands of the Philosophers.

50. *Aberdeen University Review* Autumn 1966 p 293.

51. Münsterberg (1909) and (1913) both seem to have been works valued by Drever, helping to direct him perhaps towards his long association with the selection of apprentices for the Edinburgh printing trade, still a practical feature of the Edinburgh BEd course in the 1960s.

52. See chapter 5, above.

53. An event seen, ironically in view of pre-war events, as a "return to popularity of the older (*sic*) sciences", i.e. those not housed in King's Buildings. *Student* 9 Dec 1930.

54. Collins and Drever (1926-49) - 1949 Edition.

55. Murchison (1936) p 24. It should be noted that Rusk also had a well equipped laboratory in the Dundee Training Centre. Cruickshank (1970) p 165.

56. Hearnshaw (1964) p 179.

57. Cruickshank (1970) p 168 discusses the effect on teacher-training

which was curtailed because of the reduced demand in the schools. The National Committee actually encouraged Scottish teachers to emigrate.

58. E.g. at the meeting of 30 Oct 1909 where he played a large part in a debate on examinations, but almost always had his motions defeated.
59. See chapter 3, above.
60. University College, Dundee (1883) pp 40-41.
61. He eventually became executive officer of the National Committee.
62. For some reason, the list is mentioned but not included in the Court Minutes (10 Jul 1902) but in a much later appendix. It was, however, widely published in the press (see note 141 below).
63. Rusk *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol X p 49 ff.
64. St A C throughout 1903. The problems centred in part on his wanting extra payment as a provider of t for the Local Committee's students. The Court may have been further irritated by a long haggle with Meiklejohn's son over the residue of his salary and the purchase of "maps and diagrams" that had belonged to his father. His asking price of £25 was eventually reduced to 10 guineas. Although a trivial matter, all this no doubt lowered respect for the Chair.
65. St A C 13 Apr 1907.
66. St A C 21 Jun 1907.
67. St A C 23 Oct 1909.
68. St A C 22 Oct 1910.
69. St A C 25 Sep 1911.
70. St A C 8 Jul 1916.
71. St A C 16 Jul 1920.
72. St A C 23 Sep 1921.
73. The later Professor Skinner in a BQ interview and from other BQ responses.
74. Valentine became professor in Belfast, Laird in McGill, Montreal.
75. St A C 23 Sep 1921.
76. BQ interview. He was, somewhat dramatically, to communicate his decision to Irvine during the capping ceremony at his graduation.
77. St A 9 Jun 1922.

78. A minute of Nat Comm 8 Dec 1923 summed up their attitude during the previous year. Their defence of the Chair was backed up strongly by the EIS. St A C 19 Sep 1922. The St A P C had regretted the decision at a meeting reported in the Nat Comm 24 Jun 1922.
79. St A C 30 Jun 1922 which speaks of *an* application having been received, despite newspaper advertising. It may be, of course, that Irvine had rejected all the rest, an authoritarian act that a BQ interview with Cant suggests was not beyond him.
80. St A C 16 Mar 1923.
81. Edin Sen 7 Dec 1916. The EIS protests came at their annual conference in 1917.
82. Edin Sen 9 Oct 1924.
83. BQ interview, in which he added that Principal Galloway had, quite falsely, tried to justify the abolition of the Chair on the grounds that the Bell money had been given to the university not for the funding of a chair but for the teaching of the subject.
84. *Journal of Education* Nov 1922.
85. *Journal of Education* Nov 1921.
86. Cruickshank (1970) p 167.
87. SED Report 1922-24 p 3. These matters, it said, "will be watched with great interest".
88. EIS Executive 24 Nov 1923.
89. Knox (1950b) p 37. "In 1925 ... the chair entered into a new and more influential phase of its history".
90. For example, Drever in *University of Edinburgh Journal* Autumn 1925 claims that "in 1905 ... it was felt by many educationists that the new post of Director of Studies ... should be held by the Professor". The supposition was that those favouring such a solution (including SED?) had merely been awaiting a time when both the headship of a College (usually held by the Director of Studies) and the Chair became vacant at the same time.
91. Nat Comm Minutes for 1923-24 p 335, though student numbers had improved between 1920 and 1924.
92. St A C 29 Sep 1924.
93. St A C 20 Dec 1924 notes his "willingness to help". Smith *was* invited to the next meeting, presumably because important financial issues were at stake.
94. Nat Comm 23 Feb 1924.
95. St A C 20 Feb 1924. Whereas Irvine saw the rule as being

"suspended" during any joint appointment, the National Committee had assumed it was not legally necessary.

96. The same meeting, St A C 30 Jan 1925 discussed both a draft statement of duties and salaries *and* the short list of candidates for the post.
97. Thomas (1983) p 131 cites the combined post of Principal of the Teachers College and Professor of Education at the University of Sydney, to which Mackie went from Bangor. Moody and Beckett (1959) p 489 note how the St. Andrews/Edinburgh model was followed in Belfast between 1926 and 1930 when the Principalship of Stranmillis College was combined with the Chair of Education in Queen's University. Armytage (1955a) p 256 provides an interesting reminder of how Bede College, Durham and Goldsmith's College, London, also, as training colleges, enjoyed a particularly close relationship to the University.
98. Nat Comm 8 Dec 1923.
99. Nat Comm 14 Feb 1925.
100. St A C 20 Mar 1925.
101. St A C 20 Mar 1925.
102. Aber C 14 Dec 1920.
103. Aber C 23 Dec 1920.
104. SED Reports 1924-26 p 12. He was, however, more appreciated by his ex-teachers and colleagues in Edinburgh, who had just tempted him back from Aberdeen, while the *Scottish Educational Journal* 27 Mar 1925 drew attention to his interest in philosophy.
105. Obituary by Sir Richard Lodge in *Student* 22 Oct 1924. "He revelled in getting things settled ... He was sometimes criticised for his willingness to abandon an apparently fixed conviction and to accept a compromise rather than face a deadlock."
106. Darroch (1903a) p 25.
107. Nat Comm 8 Dec 1923.
108. *Times* 9-20 Sep 1924.
109. Young in a BQ interview. She was then considering leaving Edinburgh. "Och, stay another year, lass," he pleaded, "ah'll no be lang".
110. In BQ interview.
111. Boyd Autobiography p 381.
112. In a letter to the Senate dated 14 Jan 1925.
113. Report of their decision considered at St A C 20 Mar 1925.

114. A fully worked out agreement was before the Senate (4 Jun 1925) less than six months after Morgan's approach.

115. *Educational Journal* Jun 1925.

116. *Aberdeen University Review* Mar 1926.

117. *University of Edinburgh Journal* Autumn 1925. He indicated that, for him, the essential difference between the new Edinburgh arrangement and the English Day-Training Colleges was the existence of the BEd degree and saw in recent events the fulfilment of Laurie's aims "to bring University and Training College closer together". Whether that adequately summarised Laurie's position is a different matter.

118. Morgan (1927) p 224 saw the joint appointment as the "possible start" of Education Faculties in the Universities. Thomson, on p 435 of Vol III of the *International Education Review* for 1931/32 spoke of Moray House as the "Training College of Edinburgh University". The author of Rodger (1936) is described as being employed by "Moray House, University of Edinburgh".

119. The 1943 Edition forms ED 8/52/T44 (SRO).

120. Nat Comm 27 Mar 1925.

121. Nat Comm 4 Apr 1925.

122. Nat Comm 13 Jun 1925. Edin C 15 Jun 1925.

123. Nat Comm 22 Jul 1925.

124. SED Reports 1924-26 p 12.

125. See chapter 9, below.

126. This may suggest an estrangement at the time of Darroch's death; otherwise one would have expected his pioneering work as first Chairman of the National Committee, at the very least, to come in for mention.

127. SED Reports 1924-26 p 10.

128. *Journal of Education* Feb 1926.

129. Nat Comm 13 Feb 1926.

130. Certainly it was so in the popular imagination. See, for example, the unsupported assertions of Blake (1918) p 150 which surprisingly links it to St. Andrews in claiming that both "have latterly devoted themselves in some degree to the science of education and together produce more teachers, as such (*sic*), than the larger universities".

131. *Aberdeen University Review* Mar 1926, though an article in the same journal had welcomed the arrangements in St. Andrews and Edinburgh (Nov 1925) seeing in them "a significant sign that a new

spirit is abroad", though in the same issue are examples of the perennial claim that university/college relations "had improved in recent years" – this time under Clarke who was retiring. See also Scotland (1969c).

132. Nat Comm 10 Apr 1926.

133. *Journal of Education* May 1926. In the February number he had (again anonymously) used the Aberdeen gesture to reproach Glasgow which "though the wealthiest of the Scottish Universities, seems to be content to makeshift with a Lectureship when its own dignity and the dignity of the subject require a chair". By the May 1927 issue Aberdeen had raised a further £1,000.

134. E.g. McClelland Evid 25 May 1944 by Kerr. ED 8/52/T125 (SRO).

135. McClelland Evid 18 May 1944. ED 8/52/T113 (SRO). "It paralysed the spirit of a body to have even the very excellent Education Department looking after its conduct."

136. See discussion of Lee's evidence in chapter 8 below. By the end of Boyd's period in office, the purely undergraduate MA course was "at vanishing point" (Board of Studies 24 Feb 1948) but under Nisbet, it revived and is still alive today.

137. Edin C, Edin P C, Glas C *passim*

138. Despite his later poor reputation as a test-constructor and standardiser when compared with Thomson, over 2 million copies of his tests were apparently sold.

139. Boyd Autob p 381. The lack of support for his plan from the EIS was, he says, "one of the things that gradually disillusioned (him) about the Institute".

140. Boyd Autob p 379. "The fact that I was never made Professor of Education in Glasgow was the one disappointment of my career". Despite the fact that his farewell presentation was attended by the Lord Provost, the Secretary of SED and the most distinguished of Secretaries of State, Tom Johnston, he still notes that the Dean of Arts speech was "mean and petty and grudging" p 394.

141. Boyd Autob p 162. He had in mind a minister who had successfully determined the same thing in relation to a St. Andrews chair. At that time Boyd had never been inside a Training College and had never heard any lecture on Education (p 191). Up to that point, he had had no particular commitment to a career in Education. He had unsuccessfully sought university posts in Philosophy, Economics and Geology, in all of which he was, by the standards of the day, proficient.

142. Boyd Autob p 379. He notes also that there were embarrassing but fruitless attempts by the General Council and others to have a Chair created for him personally.

143. Such an exchange of report and pleasantries appears every year in the Court minutes from 1926 till his retirement.

144. According to Inglis (BQ interview) he was paid a fee for these talks by Jordanhill though whether that was always so is far from clear. They were linked also to the origins of the Clinic. Such a course appears to be in line with Clark's earlier policy of interesting his students in "the chief educational problems of the day" (*School World* Nov 1904) but they were also anticipated by Butler of Columbia (Rugg (1952) p 32) who in 1886 filled the largest room in the College with teachers and had to turn away another 2,000 requests for tickets.
145. *Glasgow University Magazine* 28 Jan 1909.
146. *College Courant* Martinmas 1962 p 69.
147. *Glasgow University Magazine* 10 May 1933.
148. BQ interview with Smith. In the early years it is now difficult to know which of the two brothers is being referred to in the pages of the *Glasgow University Magazine*, given their identity of interest in Fabianism and the University Settlement. According to Boyd's son, Hugh, (in correspondence) the latter was particularly important as an influence.
149. See, for example, Boyd (1936) for a discussion of the Clydebank Mutual Service Association. In fact, he had been lukewarm in his early commitment and saw his wife as the prime mover, but the later involvement of such a left-wing figure as Hugh Robertson (of the Orpheus Choir) and the ready provision of Russian lessons for the unemployed can have done his reputation with the Glasgow academic establishment little good. Boyd *Autob* p 299 ff.
150. *Journal of Education* Feb 1921. He himself, as Scottish Correspondent, probably wrote this report.
151. As Inglis put it more soberly, "he was not committee-minded". *College Courant* Martinmas 1962 p 69.
152. Rusk emphasises this quality in Adams (*British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol X p 49). Laurie's style was discussed in chapter 3 above, while Young in a BQ interview, declared that Darroch "was always humorous" and normally, like Laurie, used the doric in normal conversation. Rusk's recipe for a lecture, according to Wright, was always to include a funny story and a scripture reference. If pressed, he said, the latter could be omitted (BQ interview) though McClelland apparently found Rusk a 'brusque' person, perhaps again revealing jealousy over the St. Andrews appointment.
153. *New Dominie* Vol 6 No 1.
154. Ballard (1937) p 209.
155. *New Dominie* Vol 7 No 3.
156. McPherson (1948) p 3.
157. Boyd *Autob* p 263. Before that he had only once been outside the

British Isles.

158. Boyd's "tutorials" were very large until the appointment of Inglis as his Assistant (BQ interview with latter). He also believed that the peak of Boyd's career lay in the 1930s. Much of the informality may also have derived from his close links with the University Settlement where he lived as an undergraduate.
159. *Student* 3 Feb & 10 Mar 1898.
160. McPherson (1983) p 223 citing Hetherington (1924) p 72.
161. *College Courant* Martinmas 1956 p 53.
162. BQ interview. Though this may only have been true later in his career. He himself suggested that both his speaking and teaching underwent a sudden and great change in the early 1920s. Boyd *Autob* p 207.
163. Boyd *Autob* p 388.
164. Ballard (1937) p 209.
165. Boyd *Autob* p 381 "Edinburgh did not want me because of my reputation for being too outspoken." He also claimed, however, that he could have had St. Andrews instead of McClelland (but was too busy with his guidance work) and Belfast where he feared that a general spirit of intolerance would lead to his being gagged.
166. *College Courant* Martinmas 1962 p 69.
167. He attributed this to the fact that although he was "highbrow", he was "free from any side". This, he said, had even won over Mrs McNab Shaw who particularly mistrusted intellectuals. Boyd *Autob* p 402.
168. Boyd *Autob* p 416. He looked on "the present progress of Catholicism with considerable apprehension".
169. According to Inglis (BQ interview) Boyd, unlike Laurie, never repeated a lecture.
170. Though, despite their similarities, there was no great love lost between the two men. Rusk believed Boyd had to be "got rid of" in 1946 and claimed that many graduates preferred his Jordanhill graduate course to Boyd's Diploma class, only moving to the University classes when he took over from Boyd, following the latter's retirement (BQ interview with Rusk) though Boyd himself (*Autob* p 397) emphasises the necessity for carrying out recruiting missions at Jordanhill. Some of the explanation for their rivalry may lie in the fact that Boyd had beaten Rusk for the appointment in 1907 (Glas C 6 Jun 1907) and appeared not to have backed up his unsuccessful attempt to be given a doctorate on the basis of *Experimental Education*. Rusk may also have been jealous of Boyd's status as a protege of Henry Jones and his altogether more easy early academic career, very unlike that of his own as a pupil teacher. He was not unaware that Boyd never received any

teacher training.

171. *Journal of Education* Oct 1921. By this time the *Journal* had taken over from *School World* the role of presenting Scottish educational affairs to a wider world.
172. *New Era* Aug 1935 was a special Scottish edition to commemorate the occasion.
173. Boyd Autob p 422.
174. *Glasgow University Magazine* 29 Nov 1911, though wives could only do this by supporting their husbands, given that marriage brought women's dismissal from teaching.
175. Boyd Autob p 230.
176. *Ibid.* p 235.
177. Boyd (1933) p 22.
178. Boyd (1933) p 199.
179. Collins and Drever (1936) p 69.
180. This remained a common theme of his e.g. in his celebrated Elsinore speech of 1929 (Boyd (1930) p 117 ff) which emphasised the important part teachers had to play in educational research.
181. Clarke, the Aberdeen Lecturer, acknowledged his debt to the Committee when publishing his Book on Spelling. Clarke (1921).
182. EIS Minutes (Research Committee) 1 Nov 1919.
183. *Ibid.* 4 Dec 1925.
184. A full account of the Council's foundation is given in Wake (1984) which makes extensive use of the Committee's minutes. See also Craigie (1972) and Bell (1977).
185. Boyd Autob p 224 claims that he was the first to be offered the Directorship and refused.
186. Boyd Autob p 224.
187. Graham (1965).
188. Knight (1951) p 103.
189. Neill (1936) p 158. "When I lectured six months ago in Oslo, my audience looked to me as if I had walked straight out of the pages of an Ibsen play ... it showed an interest in modern education that no Aberdeen or Edinburgh audience would show."
190. Warburton (1962) p 374.
191. Hamilton (1985b) pp 195-7.

192. He seems to have been not unpleased when Neill lost the editorship of *New Era* (Boyd Autob p 282). At the same time he was ready to defend Neill's "occasional extravagance" which, he said, "provided a challenge to thought well worth making". Boyd & Rawson (1965) p 72.
193. Stewart & McCann (1967-8) Vol V p 228.
194. For a more detailed discussion of the Clinic movement, see chapter 9 below.
195. See chapter 9 below.
196. McClelland Evid ED 8/52/T57 and T83 (SRO). Boyd was once more suggesting an undergraduate degree. The Court/Senate Committee found the idea "interesting" but did not share his views as to its "desirability or practicality".
197. At the Court meeting of 11 May 1926 McIntyre, the Lecturer in Comparative Psychology, was made a member of the Faculty of Arts "until such time as a Faculty of Education should be established".
198. Aber C 11 Jun 1929.
199. In BQ interview. McIntosh (1954) p 8 writing as a County Director acknowledges "the general debt" of Scottish education to McClelland.
200. St A C 1928-29. Unfortunately he was, however, opposed in general to post-graduate training courses "surely the stupidest way of training teachers that the mind of man can devise" and this may well have sapped his confidence in the Diploma course as such. He did, however, attract 23 students in the first year and maintained such figures till 1935 when numbers began to fall off badly, making a move to activate the degree unlikely. An attempt to do so in 1931 was blocked by the Court on financial grounds (St A C 14 Oct 1931).
201. In BQ interview.
202. Wood (1964).
203. For a general discussion of this see Bell (1975).
204. Knight (1951) p 90.
205. A popular guide to intelligence testing by Gray (1936) emphasises the role of Burt and mentions Thomson only in relation to one calculation.
206. Sandiford (1928).
207. Rugg (1947) p 750.
208. Barnard (1961) though he does mention Thomson (p 308) as one of those who helped to define the work of Professors of Education.

209. Herrnstein and Boring (1965) make no mention of anyone with Scottish connections save Bain and in Goodenough's *History of Mental Testing* (1949) there are few references to either Burt or Thomson in the 600 pages. For her the only significant Scottish figure is Cullen. Equally dismissive are Freeman, *Mental Tests: Their History, Principles and Applications* (1939) and, most surprisingly of all, Thorndike *et al.* (1927) *The Measurement of Intelligence*, though it was published somewhat early in Thomson's career.
210. Brehaut (1973) p 3.
211. Alexander (1940) where he is merely one (p 7) of a number of theorists with whom the author disagrees.
212. Vernon (1957) p 117.
213. Boyd Autob p 309.
214. Boyd (1924) p 7.
215. It was being claimed as early as 1948 "that nearly two-thirds of the children aged 11 in Great Britain undergo the (Moray House) tests each year". Malcolm and Hunter (1948) p 29.
216. Kellaghan (1982).
217. Robertson (1964) p 17.
218. Thomson (1969) p 101 "(I) was delighted to think I had found a way of helping children of intelligence who might otherwise be overlooked."
219. Simon (1971) p 84 n commenting on Thomson's own undated pamphlet *What are Moray House Tests?* in which, it is claimed, the discriminating power of MHT is such that "it is worth taking ... quotients to half points to avoid ties", even though he admits their lack of total reliability as between testing sessions. It was a remarkable claim, given that a figure such as Warburton as late as 1962 (p 386) was prepared to claim that "selection procedures that could be seriously considered by a professional psychologist scarcely exist".
220. Sharp (1979) p 75.
221. The 1933 Munich edition, bequeathed to the Edinburgh Department with much of the rest of his Educational library.
222. Tyson and Tuck (1971) p 57.
223. Laurie (1939).
224. Tyson and Tuck (1971) p 58.
225. *Student* 6 Jun 1919 contains a photograph of Field Marshal Haig and the Principal, both in uniform, on their way to a ceremony in the McEwan Hall, Edinburgh.

226. Flately (1921) p 23.
227. Lumsden in BQ letter to the author. He felt, nevertheless, that Thomson was sometimes, like the earlier Jordanhill lecturers that Boyd relieved, intimidated by the boorishness of Scottish students.
228. *Student* 15 May 1934.
229. Lee (1963) p 69 and (1939) p 79. The question of seminar versus lecture had for long been the subject of controversy in the Scottish universities. See, for example, *Alma Mater* 13 Dec 1911 and the discussion of Boyd and Jones above. McPherson (1973) p 185 suggests as an explanation of the problem the possibility that "the exercise of authority in Scottish schools does not train the university entrant to distinguish academic authority from other forms of authority which he will find exercised within the university".
230. Lumsden in BQ letter to the author.
231. Semeonoff in BQ interview.
232. BQ interview with Reith. He once declared that Moray House was "over-organised". Thomson (1969) p 76.
233. BQ interview with Young. Boyd similarly enlisted the critical skills of his Assistants. Boyd Autob p 391.
234. For example in a *British Journal of Educational Psychology* article (1936 p 174) where he attributes "most of the planning" of a West Riding experiment to Rodger and the statistical work to Mowat and Emmett. In a preface to Brown and Thomson (1925) he talks of his contribution to this influential work as simply being allowed to 'maul' Brown's original production. Had he lived long enough to complete the Edinburgh section of his autobiography, no doubt such credits would have been a significant feature. As it is, Inglis in his epilogue to the book notes how he encouraged College staff to join in the Degree teaching. Thomson (1969) p 118.
235. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XI Part I, where, reviewing *Factors of the Mind* he begins a eulogy of Burt, "If psychology ever becomes a true science ..."
236. Edin Calendar 1917.
237. Edin Sen 4 Oct 1923.
238. Thomson (1924).
239. In a BQ interview.
240. A choice that forced upon normally placed professors such as Barbara Wootton the need for early retirement. Wootton (1952). Duff in Thomson (1969) p xi mildly reproves him also for neglecting his lecturing on subjects other than mental testing "because he was a good lecturer ... and good with children".

241. Inglis in Thomson (1969) p 117.
242. Edin Sen 8 Dec 1948.
243. *Student* 7 Mar 1950.
244. *Student* 6 Nov 1951.
245. For example as a farewell gesture at the graduation in July 1950. His speech included a distinctly non-elitist tribute to the Scottish Ordinary Degree. Edin Sen 7 Jul 1950.
246. *Student* 8 Mar 1907.
247. Quite apart from his commitments to the psychological and statistical world, he had other surprising concerns. He was, for example, a member of the editorial board of the *Universities Quarterly* alongside Bragg, Tawney, Lindsay-Keir and Bowra.
248. Torrance (1981) p 48.
249. Drever (1948) p 26.
250. Murchison (1936) Vol II pp 17-34.
251. Drever (1948) p 20 "I had clambered over the fence from the adjoining field of education".
252. St A Cal 1911-12.
253. In BQ interview. When Oeser left for the RAF in 1940, Seth claimed, Philosophy regained control in St. Andrews.
254. For example, a letter to the Principal about a post in Abnormal Psychology in 1934 was described as "in extremely bad taste" (St A C 29 Sep 1934). See also St A C 24 Jan 1936 and 29 Apr 1937.
255. See chapter 9 below.
256. Bailyn (1963) p 129.
257. McClelland Report 1946 p 19.

CHAPTER 7
AFTER THE SECOND WAR

Three of the University Education Departments ended the war under men who had led them for many years previously. Only at St. Andrews had there been any change. In 1941 McClelland left to become the main officer of the National Committee and Skinner had succeeded him in both posts without any apparent controversy or calls for an end to this arrangement. Skinner had been a protégé of Principal Irvine since his undergraduate days¹ and no other candidates are mentioned in the minutes. Boyd retired in 1946 but he was for some years succeeded by Rusk and although they had a number of personal differences (for example over the Clinic)² their style and interests were sufficiently similar to cause no great disturbance in the Glasgow arrangements.³ Indeed, Rusk's influence at Jordanhill gave a great boost to the Diploma Class in Glasgow.⁴ Both there and later in Aberdeen there was the usual call from the General Council for chairs⁵ and they were now joined in this demand as well as in the demand for Faculties in all four universities by an increasingly influential body, the Association of Directors of Education.⁶

The discussion was, however, complicated by a new set of proposals emanating from a special committee of the Advisory Council, presided over by McClelland, which recommended the establishment of Institutes of Education,⁷ a new concept owing something to the English recommendations of McNair, but no means identical in every respect. This proposal would have turned groups of the existing Training Colleges into "general educational headquarters" providing not merely teacher training but leadership in recurrent teacher education, research and the professional advisory services. McClelland confessed in a letter (18 Jun 1945) to the Chairman of the Advisory Council that his aim was strictly limited. "If we could get a nice new name and a change in status (for the Colleges) ... my purpose would be served"⁸ and unlike McNair's proposals, McClelland's did not directly involve the universities' own activities.

Before giving evidence to McClelland all four Senates had debated the issue of whether the universities should take over responsibility for teacher-training but, in the event, only Edinburgh expressed any interest in being more deeply involved though even they were hardly bursting with enthusiasm. Thomson even expressed some surprise at finding them "not unwilling" knowing as he did, that they "as in all universities" held the teaching profession and the SED slightly in contempt. They had, he said, taken no active interest in the matter "but he had asked individuals and heard gossip". Curiously, Thomson himself gave two quite separate pieces of evidence, one as Professor and one as Head of Moray House. As Professor, he even expressed the view that he "did not very much like the way" in which the Training College was doing certain jobs and when discussing the possibility of an undergraduate teachers degree (the old B or C of 1912) he was asked whether he felt such a degree should be the responsibility of the university or the Provincial Committee. If he were forced, he said, he would come down on the University side. They had greater prestige and they were free from local influences and the pettinesses to be found in Education Committees. On the other hand, if the Training College was under the University, they might be cold-shouldered and would be poor relations socially though not in financial terms. Moray House was a place where they all met together but he would like a closer chemical compound.⁹ His evidence, taken as a whole, was a remarkable confession that the integration apparently intended at the time of the joint appointment had largely failed to materialise.

In the end Edinburgh University did nothing. The universities did not take over teacher training and a largely College-run teachers degree had to wait until after Robbins. Pilley, Thomson's successor, was later to see this as an opportunity lost though it must be doubtful whether SED could have allowed such a university take-over. In any case, no new teachers degree was initially envisaged by McClelland as part of the Institutes' work and only if the scheme had been a success could they eventually be seen as a home for the University Education Departments.

In the end the Institute scheme was never adopted. The Institutes would, in any case, have been less than the full University Faculties demanded by the EIS¹⁰ and by some of the political parties.¹¹ Moreover the proposals were naturally opposed by many in the University sector itself, notably Fyfe, the Principal of Aberdeen and a member of McClelland's Committee who had dissented strongly from the recommendations.¹² For him, they appeared to reinforce the division of the college and university sectors and to undermine the work of those in Aberdeen and elsewhere who envisaged a wider role for the universities themselves as "general educational headquarters", that is as providers of high level professional and research training, if not of low level teachers' degrees.

In any case, the proposals were seriously put in question by the changing nature of the Colleges themselves, for their level of instruction and their general academic atmosphere had altered considerably from the time of Thomson's appointment. The SED report for 1949 noted that whereas in 1930-31 the colleges had taught 3 graduates to every 1 non-graduate the ratio had by 1947-48 been reversed to 3:5,¹³ thus making the student body, unlike that of the universities, predominantly female and non-graduand. Moreover, in contrast to the years following 1918, there was to be in the post-second-war years an immediate and large influx into the Colleges of ex-service candidates, well-financed by government, with a far higher proportion than before anxious to do the University Diploma and Degree.¹⁴ Such a demand brought a new affluence and opportunity to the University departments which had an opportunity to increase their stature in a university sector ever more anxious to expand and to develop research. Significantly the thesis or research exercise in the education degree began to play a more prominent and diversified role in the examination. Such a movement reflected and was in part inspired by the continuing development and expansion of the American models. Rusk records how, by 1951, the index catalogue of the Bureau of Educational Research in the College of Ohio State University numbered some 340,000 items¹⁵ and Rugg notes how, by the end of the

war, Columbia Teachers College was attracting 8,000 graduate students and granting 2,000 masters and 50 doctors degrees in every academic year.¹⁶ Scotland, though the pioneer in Britain, clearly had a long way to go to match such figures but was already ahead of England, even in the raw number of dissertations completed.¹⁷ Moreover the various professions that recruited holders of the Scottish degree were all themselves expanding at a remarkable rate so that the professional fears of the 1918 students were in no sense repeated and what research there was in the Scottish departments showed up well against the continued low level of such activity in the University Education Departments of England. Ford, as a Professor at Sussex was willing to admit as late as 1964 that such English departments had "pursued very little research, most of it in Psychology ... (and) carried a staff many of whom seemed by university standards, non-academic".¹⁸ Whether his assertion was universally true (it was hardly true of the London Institute, for example) it nevertheless embodied an academic stereotype which could not easily extend to Scotland where SCORE, deeply involving the universities, had predated the similar English organisation NFER, by almost twenty years.¹⁹

The immediate post-war years saw therefore a certain buoyancy in the life of the Scottish departments. Even St. Andrews now felt it opportune to launch its degree at last and in March 1948 the Court was asked by the Senate to supply the funds,²⁰ spurred on, Skinner suggests, by the successful mounting of the Scottish Mental Survey of 1947²¹ in which all four University Departments had played an active role.²²

Such buoyancy, however, could not prevent a further crisis in the development of Educational Studies at Edinburgh University. As late as 1950 this could hardly have been foreseen. The only minor sign of differences between the Chair Universities and the National Committee was a financial squabble in 1948 when St. Andrews and Edinburgh were asked by the National Committee to agree to a change in the Professors' salaries as Directors of Studies to the Provincial Committee so as to bring them into line with new civil service scales. As the contributions from the two

contributing bodies were meant to remain in constant proportion an increase in one involved an increase in the other. This St. Andrews refused²³ and though Edinburgh grudgingly agreed, the affair was unfortunate. The University Courts were naturally sensitive to any financial pressures from outside bodies and a year later a further squabble arose between the National Committee and Edinburgh over a reverse situation, when the university proposed to pay Thomson a higher salary than the National Committee's own Executive Officer. As Thomson, in his capacity as Director of Studies at the College, was, in official, hierarchical terms meant to be that Executive Officer's inferior, this could not be allowed by the National Committee and eventually they felt obliged to raise the latter's salary,²⁴ despite strong SED protests.²⁵ None of this helped to maintain good relations but it hardly presaged a major upset.

Indeed there appeared to be no immediate intention on either side of ending the system of joint appointments and a National Committee motion from Provost Charles in December 1948²⁶ which aimed at the implementation of the McClelland's Institutes' Plan and would have severed the posts of Director of Studies and Professor in order to "free the Colleges" lacked adequate support and was later withdrawn²⁷ so that as Thomson's retirement became imminent, both parties continued, officially at least, to profess satisfaction with the joint arrangement. Even MacMurray, later regarded as the prime mover in the ultimate separation, always maintained that it had been the University's intention to continue the joint appointment and a joint committee of the Edinburgh Court and Senate, reporting in February 1951²⁸ emphasised "the desirability of continuing and developing the close liaison between University and Training College which the dual appointment had made possible". Yet less than a month later, a letter to the National Committee from the Edinburgh Provincial Committee made it clear that there must be a parting of the ways,²⁹ that in future, the Chair and the Directorship of Studies must be separate appointments. How did all this happen so suddenly, given that all the evidence of the previous year had pointed to no such change on Thomson's departure?

In June 1950 an *ad hoc* Edinburgh Court and Senate Committee had invited their colleagues in the other universities to a general conference (held at the Burn, Edzell, in January 1951) to discuss the whole future of Scotland's teacher training, apparently hoping for the development of a new national framework for their future operations. Edinburgh may have half hoped for some new involvement, as suggested in the 1944 evidence to McClelland, but according to the Glasgow delegation's report there was a general agreement to maintain the status quo.³⁰ Moreover there was, perhaps for the first time, agreement that "it was not essential to have uniformity". They also rejected a recent renewal of the EIS "Faculty" request³¹ though even at this stage Edinburgh and St. Andrews continued to appear happy with the system of joint appointments. How the situation then changed so quickly is not now entirely clear from the available documents and clearly a lot of the discussion and negotiation was by word of mouth only, covered by no minutes, at least in the public domain.

The Edinburgh University minutes in particular are singularly uninformative. Academic gossip continues to maintain that the fundamental issue was the unacceptability to the university of the Provincial Committee's favoured candidate, Inglis, who was already acting as Thomson's deputy and chief administrator of the College so that the old 1920s suggestion of a second chair seems to have been revived as a means of lessening the load on one man. It was suggested that "with revised financial arrangements, the institution (of such a chair) need not result in any considerable increased cost to the University"³² and the Provincial and National Committees forcefully pressed the idea, threatening separation if it did not appear.³³ The Court seems to have been reluctant to break off the negotiations though the problem of paying a salary to two professors was clearly a live one. Certainly *post-hoc* explanations were varied enough. The EIS, not apparently too upset by the splitting of the appointments as a possible setback for their Faculty plan (which had formed the basis of their petition only two months earlier) later argued before Robbins that it had taken place "for good reasons"³⁴ while the new Scottish Council for the

Training of Teachers (successor to the National Committee) in its evidence claimed that the volume of work had become too much for one man,³⁵ an objection, ironically, that some critics had made to Thomson's joint appointment 26 years earlier,³⁶ and this version of events seems also to have been adopted by the SED itself.³⁷ Less committedly the Edinburgh Senate in a retirement address to Thomson opined that it was "perhaps fitting that the joint sovereignty ... should come to an end with the departure of so notable a monarch".³⁸

At all events, at the Court meeting of 9 Feb, two days before meeting the other side in apparently still open negotiation, the University had decided that the first consideration was to choose a successor to the "present professor". They agreed "to explore all avenues (including a second chair) but to proceed to a Chair appointment".

This firm decision effectively brought negotiations with the National and Provincial Committees to an end and two separate appointments were made. However, whatever the financial issues and personality clashes involved, there were clearly deeper reasons why many people, including university leaders and officials, are believed to have sought such a severance of the College and University connection while trying to avoid public blame.

Certainly one fact was the long standing dislike of the Colleges and their atmosphere not just on the part of the Professors but also on the part of the many graduates undergoing training there. Such opinions were widespread throughout Scotland over many decades and were a major impediment to any improvement of the Colleges' image among the Universities' own authorities and in intellectual circles generally.³⁹ As long ago as 1901, Knight, the Headmaster of St. James's School, Glasgow had spoken of the college course as a "waste of time, an absolute decline in modern educational science, while the very mention of school management as a subject of the college curriculum excited a smile, if not ribald laughter".⁴⁰ A Glasgow debating motion of 1918 described the graduate course as "not only inadequate, but

pernicious".⁴¹ A student's letter claimed that Jordanhill was planting graduates out in rows like Baldwin's broccoli. "Cut a class the first week, and see. 'Thou shalt not' is write large across the twin towers of the building".⁴² A Jordanhill editor spoke of its reputation as "hell"⁴³ and an Aberdeen editor wrote of its College courses as "the despair of the liberally-minded student".⁴⁴ Certainly the College system appeared to find it difficult to adapt itself to the needs of a mainly graduate profession. An ex-student complained that in the 20s Psychology had been taught in Moray House "with a complete indifference to Psychology" ... "students are forced to suppress their feelings and listen in silence and bitterness as their intelligence (is) insulted day after day."⁴⁵ In 1943 the Association of Directors of Education expressed their own dissatisfaction with the current training system⁴⁶ and Wood, head of Jordanhill, admitted candidly that despite the size and academic ambitions of the large Scottish colleges "It must be said that graduates and secondary teachers in Scotland have no higher regard for training than their English counterparts".⁴⁷ In their evidence to Robbins the Scottish branch of the Association of Headmistresses claimed that graduates were "often lost to the teaching professions" because of the unsatisfactory training year,⁴⁸ while the Headmasters claimed that what colleges taught was "cigarette card" knowledge.⁴⁹ The major onslaught at the Robbins hearings however, came from Sir James Robertson, who actually submitted as evidence a paper from Dundee Diploma students bitterly attacking their college experience. "Were the allergic reaction ... a passing phenomenon," Robertson said, "or confined to a few" he would defend current practice, but this was clearly not the case and a fundamental change in Scottish teacher training was needed. If the universities were not given the job, some new institutions should do it.⁵⁰

At the same time such scepticism over graduate training courses was not confined to Scotland. It could also be found, as Wood pointed out, in England where such training was not compulsory for secondary teachers and doubts about its usefulness were widespread. As an English Inspector put it, "The blasé young graduate who

remarked, 'After going to first-rate lectures on Plato in my third year, I don't see why I need to go to third rate lectures on Plato in my fourth year' deserved to be kicked. But how many serious members of his university would have sympathised secretly with his remark, if they had heard it?⁵¹ Even when negative feelings were absent, reactions were hardly positive. As Gathorne-Hardy notes, a master at Rugby asked a well known headmaster whether he should take the graduate training year before entering the profession. "It can do no harm," was the reply. "And after all, you needn't *tell* people you have been trained".⁵²

Given the proportion of English public school boys in the Scottish professoriate of the 1950s it would not be surprising therefore to discover that such English scepticism over the usefulness of the Colleges and graduate training had augmented the traditional Scottish aversion to the College course. That this was the case is suggested by Thomson's evidence to McClelland quoted earlier and it no doubt provided further allies in the Senate for those wishing to distance the Universities from such institutions - especially as some professors were already irritated by their own limited representation on the Provincial Committee.⁵³

At the same time the Scottish colleges were not without their defenders. A Jordanhill student, for example, felt that undergraduates were given too *much* freedom and that in college it was good for them to return "to a scene of things wherein discipline and compulsion must to a great extent enter as a training for the ordered routine of the profession",⁵⁴ while Inglis in his own evidence to Robbins suggested that "we tend to hear from the failures, the people who had complaints to make" and claimed that in an anonymous questionnaire which he collected from honours graduates at Moray House, "a large proportion of graduates expressed themselves well content".⁵⁵ Inglis also suggested that the "notion of the down trodden graduate" was out of date, a view that came also from Charlton *et al.* following an investigation of attitudes on English training courses,⁵⁶ while McIntyre and Morrison sampling English and Scottish students both during training and afterwards (and including in that

sample a number of Scottish University Diploma students) discovered a greater degree of naturalism and radicalism in the female products of a purely college course, compared with those who took the university Diploma⁵⁷ and these were not student characteristics that accorded with the current Scottish stereotype of Colleges purveying conservative, authoritarian values.

There were, however, a number of reasons why opposition to the Scottish College style should become particularly virulent in the post-war period, even if things *were* improving. One was the presence of a large number of mature ex-servicemen who were to dominate graduate classes not merely in the late 40s but until well into the 60s, when those who had had to do compulsory military service finally disappeared into the system. Such men were even less likely than their predecessors to relish the atmosphere of colleges increasingly geared to the needs and experience of female school-leavers,⁵⁸ though even female graduates who were, on the whole, younger than their male counterparts, resented the dubious psychological assumptions of a regime that not only continued an unnecessary segregation of the sexes⁵⁹ but attempted to exercise control over their private morals and could even put them in a sandpit to play "so that they would know how small children feel".⁶⁰

Moreover, the growth of libertarian sentiments among students, now misleadingly seen as a purely 60s phenomenon, was already, in the 50s, leading both to more active words of protest and to a far more vigorous student journalism. "Petty autocracy" said a student editor in 1957, "can be found a stone's throw from this office. It has come to the notice of our sales organisation at Moray House that they may not ply their trade there without authority being obtained on each separate occasion. It would not be untrue to say that this is merely the latest of many actions that Moray House has taken to stifle all independent ... thought and activity. A spirit of unthinking uncritical regimentation is abroad in the dark grey institution presided over by the mentally blind. There university graduates have to answer a roll-call like children of 12 ... and if a member of staff writes one a caustic letter, as often

happens, with the request that it be shown to one's parents, one has to produce a signed note from one's parents *proving* that *they* have read that letter".⁶¹

Clearly graduates *were* disgruntled and the one way of escape from at least part of the college course became increasingly popular. Participation in the University Diploma (which could give exemption from the college courses in Education and Psychology) rose from 25% of all graduate students under Thomson to over 40% by the end of the 50s.⁶² This development was in fact made easier by the more widespread availability of mandatory university grants than in the pre-war period and was probably encouraged also by the increasing appearance in Scotland of English students, who preferred and expected to be trained under university auspices in what they took to be the more relaxed English manner.

One letter from a Diploma student concurrently undergoing college training in January 1958 asked "What might happen to those who do not come under the humanising effect of the university's Department of Education?"⁶³ and that appears to have been a question already being asked by at least some of those university leaders who engineered the division of the Chair and College. Some, notably the Philosopher John MacMurray and his circle, were already worried, even in Thomson's time, by his reputation for seeing all human life in terms of statistics, "more at home with 3.999 pupils than with four", as it was put by his enemies.⁶⁴ They felt, as did many in America, that the measuring movement had gone too far and that there should be a return to the humanistic, Philosophy-dominated world of Laurie and Meiklejohn. Whether their judgement was fair on Thomson personally came therefore to be quite beside the point.

MacMurray himself, as a Philosopher, was not only preoccupied with the quality of human relationships but had actively warned, on both sides of the Atlantic, of the dangers of misapplied Psychology. In his "Boundaries of Science" in 1939 he had reminded an American audience that Psychology could only become accepted as a

legitimate science if one either abandoned the normal scientific demand for objectivity or allowed it to speak only about very limited forms of human action.⁶⁵ Moreover he saw its future role as potentially sinister. "So far from solving the problem, 'How can we control the world?', Psychology sets the question, "Who is to control whom?" and introduces a universal struggle to control one another which, if it develops, must make all effort to control the environment impossible and make the work of science itself equally impossible",⁶⁶ and while he no doubt regarded Thomson himself as a man of wider vision, he could never trust his commitment to mental testing and was always aware of the moral and social dangers that it posed. For him, education was "learning to be human".⁶⁷ Indeed he felt that neither testing nor experimental psychology, should lie at the heart of any education course. For a university was not a continuation of schooling nor a professional training ground "... When a student is admitted to a university he becomes a member of a *community* which exists to serve the development of culture and the advancement of knowledge". His criterion for the success of a university was a demanding one. "If it fails to be a focus of cultural synthesis, it will at the last provide a specialised professional training ... which is poorly related to the national balance of human life and human personality".⁶⁸ If students' reports and university opinion were to be believed, Moray House *was* so "poorly related" and therefore the future of the University Department was unlikely to improve under Inglis, who had for long served as Thomson's deputy and had helped to create the College's current, unpopular atmosphere.

It may well be also that MacMurray who was Dean of Arts in the University, already had a candidate for the Chair in mind.⁶⁹ Certainly the views of the eventual appointee, Pilley, were clearly congenial to him. Like Boyd, Pilley had begun life as a natural scientist but by the time he arrived in Edinburgh his major concern had become "the studies of literature, history and philosophy" and he believed that "for these studies to exercise their educative power the student must learn to use them as an aid to reflection upon his own capacity as a human being ... Great works of

literature and philosophy are themselves teachers of self-knowledge". He accepted Leavis's view that the study of great literature in one's native language must form the basic element of university education in the way that Classics had once done and that, in the education of teachers in particular, the study of "Great Books" must take precedence over everything else.⁷⁰ Pilley was, indeed, the brother-in-law of Leavis's ally, I.A. Richards, whose talks on language and feeling were to be a regular feature of his Edinburgh department.

Such views were not of course new in British teacher training. As early as 1912, Sir Fred Clarke, a highly influential figure in English training colleges, had specifically stood out against Rusk and the other "experimental education" innovators – "It is the vice," he said, "of the experimental psychologist that he ignores most completely what the teacher needs to know and study more completely, the developing *whole* of an individual and for this a table of coefficients or a network of graphs can never be a fair equivalent." For him this opened up the not very pleasant prospect of having engineers of education who would act as "intermediaries between the psychologist and the practising teacher, having under their control relays of drilled mediocrities".⁷¹

Even those exposed to the disciplines of the Scottish education degree, felt things had been carried to excess. Professor Morris of Bristol, for example, who had been a student under Boyd and later his Assistant, attacked the work of Thomson and his colleagues in just such terms "The psychology of mental measurement," he claimed, "through a failure to examine adequately its own presuppositions (has) developed into a mere technology... The very success of the scientific approach and the spell cast by quantitative techniques" Morris claimed, "have resulted latterly in a narrowing of vision in research and in the growth of a rigidity within the scientific movement. An atmosphere inimical to speculation and critical reflection has developed."⁷²

Morris had been a colleague of Pilley's in the Bristol University Education Department which aimed to foster "sustained hard-work based on an attitude of

enquiry", had been "the pioneer in abolishing a final written examination for the award of the PGCE",⁷³ and had enthusiastically followed the recommendation of the McNair report, cutting down formal lectures and setting up the small classes and discussion groups that Thomson had vainly tried to popularise in the Edinburgh of the 1920s⁷⁴ and which Pilley himself had very much enjoyed during the twelve years he had spent as a teacher in Wellesley College, Massachusetts.

During this stay in America, he had no doubt been influenced by the strong belief among educationists there that the most enlightened forms of teacher-training are dependent on their situation in a university. The history of American educational studies had involved many demarcation disputes between the University and Normal School sectors from which the former had emerged the clear victor,⁷⁵ in what was seen as a real (but probably unnecessary) battle between "liberal" and "professional education."⁷⁶

Not surprisingly, therefore, when faced with the Scottish situation and with the reputation of Thomson and Moray House as well as with the, to him, restrictive teacher-training regulations of the SED, Pilley clearly saw himself as a Liberator whose task demanded belligerence not only towards what he took to be pettifogging legalism but also towards the quantitative techniques of the ever-strengthening social sciences - Psychology and Sociology in particular. Thus he deplored the subsequent appointment of the "statistician" Nisbet (albeit an Edinburgh BEd) as the first Aberdeen professor⁷⁷ and in 1958, in a *Universities Quarterly* article, felt able to launch a full public attack not only on the SED's new training regulations which, he said, would "bring dismay to all who have been hoping that ... Scottish teachers would in future be prepared for their job in such a way as to carry a new breath of life and learning into the schools" but also on the Scottish Colleges which he felt were falling "so far short of commanding the respect shown to other professional schools such as those in medicine, law, architecture, agriculture etc."⁷⁸

Pilley's sentiments were not unlike those regularly uttered by his predecessors earlier in the century. Boyd had spoken of Jordanhill as "much inferior to the university" and had bridled at having "to send in a weekly postcard, reporting absentees and the reasons ... as if they were so many children trying to dodge attendance".⁷⁹ Darroch had claimed that "purely college course students (were) turned out without any depth of knowledge and without any real intellectual interests in after life"⁸⁰ but the situation had now changed somewhat. Both the SED and the Colleges were by now much more powerful opponents. The government was rapidly becoming a major patron of university research and funding, the arbiter of how far the BEd was eligible for grants and how far Pilley's graduates were eligible for recognition in the public service and, unlike in the England of Pilley's previous experience, such things had an especial importance in Universities without any right to take part in graduate training. Equally, the Colleges, though no doubt seen by many as academically, socially and spiritually inferior to the universities, could now look for political support to the EIS and the Scottish Labour Party (whose leaders now sat extensively on their Boards of Governors) as well as to a politically influential Roman Catholic Church, always jealous for the rights of its own two Colleges. The Scottish Colleges had developed, through their size and comparative affluence,⁸¹ their large graduate element and no doubt also, through the presence in them of well-known figures such as Thomson and McClelland with their University Departments,⁸² a self-confidence that far exceeded that of most of their English counterparts. Certainly that was the impression given, according to Willey and Maddison, to the select committee enquiry of 1971⁸³ as well as to the ministers who, later in the 1970s, tried to close some of them.

Pilley was clearly initially unaware of such a political background, for, in his English eyes, it was self-evident that Training Colleges were *sui generis* inferior, if only because they were in the pocket of the civil servants. The holding of such an opinion did not involve any despising of traditional Educational Studies as such, for even in

Germany, Lundgreen suggests, teacher training colleges only came on to an equal social footing with the universities in the 1960s.⁸⁴ In any case, such Colleges in Britain in the 1950s were believed, with some justification, to attract to their non-graduating courses only those students who had "failed" university entrance and such institutions for "failures" were, it was often assumed, likely also to attract academic failures as unsatisfactory leaders. For Pilley, therefore, there was no need to exercise the caution that Laurie had shown in making his attacks on the narrowness of the Colleges and, in his general approach to the Edinburgh context, he showed a pugnacity that gave him a far wider range of academic and political enemies than any of his predecessors had faced. Even in the university context he openly showed a deep mistrust of the Social Sciences. In a letter to MacMurray⁸⁵ he claimed that social science "students ... are led to overlook the fact that the genesis of much that has a profound influence on social development has its origin in a speculatively working imagination ... Sociologists are concerned with theories that have an imaginative origin (but) they are to my mind mostly defective theories (with) deplorable social consequences" and on such grounds he opposed the idea of his department moving from the Arts to the new Social Science Faculty.⁸⁶ He spoke of the visiting B.F. Skinner as a "monstrous" man⁸⁷ and continued till his death to call Drever *fil/s*, (who had succeeded his father in the Psychology chair) "Drever" even though other more distant colleagues had from the first been regularly addressed by their first names. Even so, he could speak well of the American psychologist Bruner,⁸⁸ could urge the appointment of Edinburgh's first Sociology Professor, Burns, to committees because of his "insight into educational questions"⁸⁹ and was quite happy to tolerate moves by favourite students in a psychological direction.⁹⁰

At the same time Pilley was ambivalent about his role as Thomson's heir to what was now the Moray House testing empire. While agreeing in general terms with MacMurray and the other critics of Thomson's psychometric concerns, he was no doubt flattered at finding himself in such an influential position and such a state of

institutional affluence. On occasions he even dabbled in test construction himself and engaged in learned discourse on the subject of Moray House tests, even defending their use in the 11+,⁹¹ criticism of which was, he said, "misinformed", basing his arguments on Vernon's evidence of the effects of the uneven supply of places by the LEAs.⁹² He worried about the growing rivalry from the English National Foundation for Educational Research, which had also begun to supply 11+ tests, and he supported new ventures into the world of 18+ selection.⁹³ True, he agonised over the continuing use of the name "Moray House" with its College connotations but, regretfully, he had to admit that the name was "so well established that its removal would lead to confusion".⁹⁴ Even so he wanted the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, when reproducing a specimen test, to blot out the words, "Moray House" and the names of the people involved from the entry and it is doubtful whether he would ever have modified his anti-College stance even if he had been fully aware of the political dangers to his Department which it involved.

He probably underestimated such dangers because he knew that, in his anti-College campaign, he had the full support of influential figures such as Robertson, who was continually questioning both the quality and the pretensions of the colleges' graduate training course⁹⁵ and of departmental colleagues who were also committed to similar views. One of these, Hamilton, an Edinburgh graduate with a wide experience of English Colleges and Universities, published in May 1958 an article in the official *University of Edinburgh Gazette*⁹⁶ on the training of graduate teachers "to call the attention of teachers in this university to how unsatisfactory a role the universities play in the training of teachers in Scotland, to claim that it is one which is not consonant with the status and function of a University; and to call for reform". A last minute attempt was made by the University Secretary to persuade Hamilton to withdraw his article but he insisted on publication. Using strong biblical and literary imagery, he noted that over 50% of graduates in training were now opting for the Diploma despite the "indifference" of SED which refused to give it any

recognition in the salary scales. Going to the college was, he said, "to live backwards (in Keats's phrase)", to encounter a "spiritual and intellectual myopia" and to be treated as a school child. He repeated the claim that such training methods were diverting "the first-rate minds" from teaching and though the Colleges were now lavishly financed, they still had "the utilitarian stamp of their origin". Given College attitudes, he claimed, "it (was) scarcely surprising that the work of the University Departments of Education should be regarded with suspicion if not with hostility or that a concentrated endeavour should be made ... to pre-empt the student's best working hours for "practical" activities". In such circumstances talk of great contact and cooperation between College and University was mere pious rhetoric. "I do not believe the University Departments of Education should be allowed to continue as mere appendixes to the colleges, providing a Diploma course ... which only the (University) Departments themselves regard with any seriousness" ... "Rigidity, impenetrability and complacent belief in an elect" ... he concluded, "are only too evident as features of SED and thereby of our Colleges and schools".

Such strong public attacks as those of Hamilton and Pilley could hardly be ignored and had considerable consequences for the future of the Edinburgh Department. The strength of the attacks on SED had been paralleled only by Darroch in his years of disillusionment with the Provincial Committees but at that time there was less need to be cautious, given that Struthers was still heavily dependent on the Universities for the provision of much College teaching. Now that the Colleges were well staffed, the government owed the Universities considerably less so far as Educational Studies were concerned and SED was further incensed by Pilley's continual attack on just those types of quantified research and technical training in Psychology and Testing that they felt it was the residual task of the University Education departments to provide. Pilley also appeared to be deliberately restricting the supply of the only product of his department that SED really valued, namely BEd graduates, a dissatisfaction intensified by the drastic fall in student numbers produced by the

insistence of Drever *fills* on the full-time course being lengthened to two years in order to satisfy British Psychological Society requirements. Given that the other three universities were still managing to complete the full-time course in one year or were allowing less expensive part-time study, it was hardly likely that SED could happily offer two year grants to Edinburgh students, especially in the face of such abuse. Thus it was no surprise that by the mid 60s the size of the Edinburgh BEd class had shrunk to tiny proportions. In 1957, there had been 11 graduates. In 1962, there were 2 – both of them Greek – and for the remainder of its life, the degree continued to attract a mere handful of students, most of them from outwith Scotland. The great distinguishing and widening task of the University Departments envisaged by Darroch and Drever had shrunk to almost nothing, and the function of the Professor had been reduced to something less than that of Laurie in his difficult heyday.

As for the Colleges, they naturally resented the onslaught. Inglis, Thomson's successor as head of Moray House College, no doubt already wounded by the controversy surrounding his own aspiration to the Chair, asked the Robbins Committee with some justification, to explain why he, who for so many years had worked in the liberal atmosphere of Boyd's department as his chief Assistant, could now be cast in the role of the philistine enemy of enlightened teacher training, how "in passing from one institution to the other he had developed curiously illiberal attitudes, principles and practice".⁹⁷ He indicated that Moray House would keep the Thomson tradition of research alive even if the new Professor was not prepared to do so,⁹⁸ though it has to be noted that his insistence on the College combining research and high academic study with teacher training represented a considerable move from Inglis' earlier views on the separation of University and College tasks expressed when he himself still had hopes of the mooted Glasgow chair likely to follow Boyd's retirement. At Callander in November 1943, for example, he had agreed that Professors of Education should not be associated too closely with the Training College work. The professor being in an independent position, he claimed, could be straightforward

in his criticism of Scottish education in a way that was not possible if he was head of a Training College.⁹⁹ Now that Pilley was exercising just such independence on a major scale, attacking all the main, traditional elements of Scottish education, he appeared far from pleased.

At the same time, if MacMurray and his colleagues had expected Pilley to wipe out the department's thirty years of devotion to Mental Testing, they were to be disappointed, for production of Moray House Tests (now, since the separation of posts, linked to Moray House only in name) actually increased as the post-war use of testing for secondary selection developed. By 1954 they were being used by three quarters of all the local authorities in the United Kingdom, enjoying such popularity, Vernon suggests, because they "needed nothing beyond the competence of every teacher".¹⁰⁰ Indeed the income became so great that the staff involved were eventually able to form the nucleus of an independent Research Unit, financed almost entirely from the Thomson Research Fund,¹⁰¹ the product of profits on the sale of tests, which not only proved increasingly useful to Pilley in the absence of special funding from SED and elsewhere but also helped considerably to augment the department's staff beyond the levels that the attraction of students or UGC norms could have justified.

Pilley's campaign against Moray House was not, however, an entirely new departure. In many ways, he was the result rather than the cause of any cleavage. Young, who had been involved in both University and College at the time of Thomson's arrival felt that she had seen a steady deterioration in University/College relations throughout the late 40s and the early 50s even under Thomson,¹⁰² and some observers saw in the division of the posts an opportunity to check an already growing rift. During the 1951 negotiations the hope had been expressed that in making separate appointments, the two bodies "would emphasise in their respective conditions of appointment that the persons appointed shall cooperate with one another".¹⁰³ Thus the University Department physically remained initially in Moray

House while formal steps were taken to ensure that the Thomson Research Fund would finance work undertaken by both institutions¹⁰⁴ and the standing committee of University Court and Provincial Committee was reconstituted.¹⁰⁵

The peace did not last long, however. At Pilley's insistence the Department moved out of the College buildings and in 1956, there was a manifestation of what many saw as Inglis' spite. At first it seemed that mere technical problems in the college timetable were producing difficulties for the many Diploma students who were concurrently undergoing teacher training and now had to move, in the course of the day, between the University, the College and the schools where they were doing teaching practice. It was felt that there had been inadequate discussion of the more sophisticated timetabling that this required, though some felt that subsequent timetable problems had been deliberately meant to damage the Diploma and to diminish the influence exerted by the University over the teacher-training process. Despite the SED embargo on the provision of it by the University, Pilley, in English style still saw the Diploma primarily as a way of influencing the thinking of future teachers. To him this was more important than its function as the provider of a pool of talent from which to draw his BEd students, the teaching of whom was now the officially ascribed major role of a Scottish University department. To many of the college staff, however, Pilley's expansion of the Diploma class seemed an elitist device whereby the cream of their graduate class was removed from their charge for Diploma students were exempted from the College's own Education and Psychology classes - an exemption that had had little significance in Thomson's time when much the same staff taught both the College and University classes. Now, however, it seemed to imply that the teaching of such an elite by College staff must be inferior and seemed an inappropriate arrangement at a time when such elitist distinctions were being increasingly eroded in the secondary school sector. Considerable bitterness ensued when Robertson, a friend of Pilley, accused not just Moray House but some other colleges of deliberately hampering the Diploma's development.

Logistical difficulties, he said, could not "excuse the uncooperative and querulous attitude taken by the Colleges" towards the Diploma arrangements and he claimed that College staff had carried the quarrel into the classroom.¹⁰⁶ He therefore pressed upon the Robbins committee his proposal for a complete take-over of graduate training by the universities.

In Edinburgh, a compromise was arranged that still proved unsatisfactory both to Pilley and to a majority of his colleagues in the Senate who now clearly began to resent Inglis' belligerence. The University Principal, Appleton, openly questioned Inglis' version of events¹⁰⁷ and relations between the College and the whole university went from bad to worse. For more than two years negotiations over the timing and location of Diploma classes preoccupied the Provincial Committee and continued to irritate the Senate. At a major confrontation in February 1958,¹⁰⁸ MacMurray and Drever *filis* put the university's position which, MacMurray said, "was very different from that of the Provincial Committee" and expressed the view that cooperation was no longer possible. "Anything likely to lower the University's standards must not be allowed". It would be better to give up the Diploma than to allow the standard to fall. "Of this standard the University was the sole and only judge, otherwise the University would cease to be an independent body".¹⁰⁹

This matter of the university's independence was crucial. It was now facing the ultimate consequence of Thomson's joint appointment. By linking the University department in 1925 to the larger and more powerful units of National Committee and College (both under strict SED control), the University Court had allowed the initiative for the arrangement of the details of the Diploma course to pass into other hands. Given the demand in the Diploma Regulations that the candidate should be a trained teacher, the providers of such training could in any case dictate their own rules as most Diploma students trained as teachers concurrently. Throughout the protracted negotiations therefore, the University could hardly take the initiative but could merely react to the proposals of Inglis. He knew that SED could kill any university attempts at

independent teacher training by simply withholding certification, as they had done fifty years earlier. The English ideals of Pilley and Hamilton were impossible of achievement in a Scottish context unless SED and the Colleges willed it.

In the end, largely perhaps through weariness, the two sides worked out a temporary *modus vivendi* and there was probably general relief when Robbins' suggestion that, in the interests of better relations,¹¹⁰ all Scottish graduate teachers should take the Diploma was simply ignored. However, soon after his appointment, Inglis' successor McIntosh, with all the confidence of a staunch disciple of Thomson, demanded that the College actually be allowed to take over the entire running of the Diploma, creating new tensions that were to be still unresolved twenty years later.

There were to be developments also in St. Andrews. When, some three years after Thomson's retirement, Skinner decided to go elsewhere, it took but a short time to decide that there too the two posts should in future be divided and so far as the Senate was concerned, many of the factors which influenced the Edinburgh decision, probably carried weight there. In their case, the Professor, with his College duties in Dundee, was even more isolated from the main university centre than was the case in Edinburgh and some of his St. Andrews colleagues may have shared MacMurray's wish to turn away from what appeared to be the statistical preoccupations of the last two professors, McClelland and Skinner,¹¹¹ in a more humanistic direction though as with the Edinburgh judgments on Thomson, such opinions underestimated the traditional Scottish generalism of both the professors concerned. Certainly they appointed as the new, independent Professor, Adams, an inspector distinguished in Classics and a man more in the Meiklejohn than the McClelland tradition. About the division of the two posts there appeared to be little controversy either in the University or, in the Provincial and National Committees. Initially, in June 1954, a new salary agreement for a joint appointment had been drawn up¹¹² but by the end of the summer the University Court "while it took no firm decision, was strongly inclined to think that it might be desirable (to separate the posts) ... as experience in the recent past (had)

shown that it (was) difficult for the professor to give as much of his time as was desirable to his University duties (particularly as it was hoped to expand the new Degree work)¹¹³ and the National Committee apparently reached much the same conclusion.¹¹⁴ The story behind this decision was, however, by no means as straightforward as such wording suggests, given that Thomson in *his* joint appointment had run a successful Degree course for over a quarter of a century.

In the St. Andrews case, there had been the usual complications concerning the university's activities in Dundee. The St. Andrews/Dundee connection had recently been the subject of no less than two governmental enquiries: the Cooper Enquiry of 1949, initiated by the Secretary of State and a Royal Commission under Tedder which met during 1951-52. Both had examined the Education Department's affairs in some detail as its activities and resources were spread over both centres and the continual travelling involved had even led the Tedder Commission to take relevant evidence from British Railways.¹¹⁵ There was the usual temptation to assume that all or most of the teacher education must be centred in the bigger centre of population but the general scale of academic activity in St. Andrews itself had now grown considerably. The university's activities there were by this time on the same scale as those in Aberdeen, Nottingham or Sheffield¹¹⁶ and its survival was by no means as much in doubt as it had been in the days of Donaldson and Meiklejohn.

When Cooper reported, the Degree work had barely begun, but a sizeable Diploma class was already being provided in both centres, involving a long journey for St. Andrews students to the Dundee Training Centre for their professional training,¹¹⁷ a necessity which, according to the student newspaper, sometimes made them seem remote from the close communal life of St. Andrews itself,¹¹⁸ but no suggestion for solving this problem was made by Cooper, the Committee being somewhat diverted by the possibility of the creation of a large new male Roman Catholic college in one or other of the centres in which the dying notion of concurrent training for undergraduates might well be revived.¹¹⁹

The generally inconclusive nature of the first report encouraged in due course the rather more decisive tone of Tedder, who again was careful to avoid the stereotyping of Dundee as the bigger and therefore potentially the more progressive of the two centres. The report noted, for example, how "St. Andrews did not suffer between the two world wars from the stagnation which was the lot of Dundee" and it recalled the continual questioning of the Dundee Training College's viability.¹²⁰

In Education, Tedder encountered a complicated situation. Some Diploma and Degree courses were given only in Dundee, one (Experimental Psychology) was given only in St. Andrews and the remainder in both.¹²¹ Moreover, Cooper's hopes for a Roman Catholic college and concurrent courses had now largely faded.¹²² In purely practical terms, therefore, on finding that a majority of Education-related classes took place in Dundee, Tedder decided that they should all be centred there, believing that future staff would prefer an arrangement which did not involve 2-3 hours travel in the middle of a working day and one which identified them clearly, for general purposes, with one centre or the other.¹²³ With the provision of Psychology in Dundee, there would be few logistical problems.

Shafe notes that the St. Andrews action on the Tedder proposal produced "some lack of amity" between the University and the National Committee whom Tedder had never consulted. The Training College Director had been partly paid by the university in respect of part-time work "and when the post fell vacant in 1954, it was an annoyed National Committee that severed the university connection and advertised for a full-time director", leaving the university free.¹²⁴ Thus, Shafe implies, it was the Edinburgh situation in reverse, though that must remain open to question.

The only real problem was that the Professor of Education would now be finally moved from St. Andrews to a centre in which his role had no traditional base and while Adams continued to run his Department on much the same lines as those of the other Universities, when he finally retired it was to become even more defenceless

than it had been in the early 20s. Then it had been saved by the General Council with the EIS preventing the Court from abandoning a Chair for which it had accepted outside endowments.¹²⁵ However, in the 60s the Chair, in consequence of its complete absence from St. Andrews, had been transferred to the new Dundee University, which felt no legal obligation to preserve it, and in 1985, Meiklejohn's Chair was to be swallowed up in the new appointment, concerned mainly with extra-mural teaching, of Director for Continuing Education.

Ironically, therefore, it was the two Scottish Departments that had entered the post-war world *with* actual Chairs that lost most ground in the decades that followed, while the initially Chairless Glasgow and Aberdeen were to find themselves considerably strengthened. In Glasgow the diversified base established by Boyd and maintained by Rusk proved profitable to the university both in financial and in local public-relations terms and in the increasingly subsidised academic world of the immediate post-war years it became at last possible in 1949 to fulfil the General Council's long-standing request for a Chair. The Court had expressed itself in favour "in principle" as long ago as 1937¹²⁶ and again in 1942¹²⁷ but on both occasions had found it impossible "financially" though there must be some suspicion that Boyd's continued presence was a deterrent factor, given that Principal Hetherington was generally regarded as unwilling to promote him.¹²⁸ But by 1947 with the most obvious but most controversial candidate no longer on the scene the political risk (in Senate eyes) seemed less¹²⁹ and the scope for further expansion seemed considerable. The numbers studying for the EdB had risen by over 50% (20 graduated in 1948 but by 1951 it had become 32).¹³⁰ Moreover Hetherington, the first Principal to show much of an interest in such matters since the death of McAllister, had not only been awarded an EIS Fellowship but had continually emphasised the University's role as a trainer of professionals.¹³¹

Boyd had by this time been made a Reader and on his retirement an attempt was made to fill the vacancy,¹³² now apparently to a permanent Readership, and four

candidates (three of whom later became professors elsewhere) were interviewed but the successful candidate declined the appointment and the matter seems to have lapsed. As a result, Rusk took on a temporary appointment "for one or two years".¹³³ A year later, the Court received a letter from the General Council again calling for a Chair¹³⁴ and on this occasion merely "deferred consideration", rather than rejecting it outright, pending a ruling from the Privy Council on an Aberdeen request to be allowed to establish chairs "without endowment". A favourable ruling was given and Glasgow decided to prepare a suitable Ordinance.¹³⁵ In the following April, the proceeds from Boyd's Spelling List which the EIS had been holding as the basic endowment of a Chair were handed to the Court,¹³⁶ and early in 1949, the latter proceeded with the arrangements for making an appointment.¹³⁷ The process proved a protracted one, however, and although S. Nisbet was appointed early in 1950,¹³⁸ he was unable to take up his appointment until the Autumn of 1951, when the EIS submitted to the Court yet another Faculty request which was discussed and rejected at the Burn Conference of all four universities mentioned earlier.

In Glasgow the college/university relationship was a much more healthy one. The physical distance that separated the largest College, Jordanhill, from the University and the lack of the direct University involvement in College affairs that the joint appointments had produced, meant, on the whole, that Glasgow avoided Edinburgh's problems, as their evidence to McClelland made clear¹³⁹ though it is worth speculating on how far, even in Edinburgh, much of the controversy of the 50s and 60s could have been avoided if Pilley and Inglis had been replaced by the less combative figures of the new Glasgow professor, Nisbet, and the Jordanhill Principal, Wood who, as we have seen, could good-humouredly accepted his graduate students' poor opinion of his course and their preference for the University Diploma.

In Aberdeen also a Chair was eventually to appear. Hopes there had been high in the immediate post-war period partly because the wartime promotion of Walker and Rex Knight, the Psychologist, to the Senate had given them a greater political

influence.¹⁴⁰ Hopes were again encouraged by the 1947 ruling that adequate endowment was no longer a pre-requisite for the establishment of Scottish chairs¹⁴¹ and in 1949, no doubt spurred on by events in Glasgow, the General Council made a firm recommendation that Education should follow Psychology in being so recognised. However the Senate was not in favour¹⁴² and although the Principal kept promising action in the General Council¹⁴³ it was not until 1960 that they were to see an Ordinance¹⁴⁴ and it was not until 1963, at the end of the long but successfully developmental Walker period, that the Chair was finally filled.

The first holder of the Aberdeen Chair, John Nisbet, had already worked in Walker's department for many years and like his brother, the first Glasgow professor, was able to develop not merely the Diploma and Degree but also a major research programme which reflected the needs of his region as well as of Scotland as a whole. Both Nisbets were thus able to attract far more support for their work from SED and, indeed, from the London Research Councils than were the holders of the older chairs, though, in this respect Boyd had been something of a Scottish pioneer, having raised funds from the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, as well as from SCRE, for his major Evacuation Enquiry in 1939-40.¹⁴⁵

Despite his earlier career in the Inspectorate, Adams at Dundee had little interest in statistically based research in Education, although he tolerated it in his colleagues. Pilley, though he had continued to encourage the profitable activities of the Thomson Research Fund staff, had positively frowned on the Aberdeen/Glasgow type developments and had convinced some professional colleagues that, despite his Natural Science background, he scorned research and scholarly activity altogether, so bitter were his comments on social scientists generally. This was unfair because he did maintain the department's Philosophical and Historical work at a high level and firmly established comparative studies for the first time, while he saw his own role as fitting into the Laurie rather than the Thomson tradition of scholarship as he made clear when accepting Laurie's portrait for the Department in 1962.¹⁴⁶ However,

following his retirement, the department's fate lay in the hands of a Principal, Swann, who, as a colleague, probably *had* believed Pilley's commitment to research to be half-hearted. Swann already had experience both of Moray House's grievances (he was a member of the Provincial Committee) and of the displeasure of Social Science colleagues riled by Pilley's attacks. He had also had some experience of setting about the abolition of long-established chairs,¹⁴⁷ such as that in Hebrew and he seemed determined therefore either to make major changes in the Education Department's role or to get rid of it. If it were not to disappear, then certainly he felt that Edinburgh should not only follow the path of Glasgow and Aberdeen in developing a clearly social science-orientated research commitment but that unlike them, it should abandon the Diploma to the Colleges and concentrate on high level post-graduate work of a type that would make its mark outside a Scottish context. With this in mind, he engaged as Professor a fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Hudson, who had hitherto taken no part in the work of either a University Education Department or of the school system, though he had done research in schools on psychological/anthropological lines. He thus represented an entirely new departure from the Nisbets who as Thomson/Drever graduates had launched their research programmes within the still recognisably Scottish tradition established in their departments by Walker and Boyd.

Hudson symbolically took down the Department's portraits of Laurie and Darroch,¹⁴⁸ attempted to have the chair's title changed to "Intellectual Development"¹⁴⁹ thus dropping the, to him, embarrassing term "Education" and set about (in his own phrase) "picking winners"¹⁵⁰ - PhD candidates, most of whom had no special Scottish connections. To him, the remaining members of Pilley's staff were not so much new colleagues as bodies "left over by an earlier regime".¹⁵¹ The Thomson testing service was, if anything, more ideologically distasteful to him than it had been to Pilley. At a conference in 1970 he commented that "it had taken psychologists 50 years to sell mental testing to the public, and it would take them

another 50 years to buy it back".¹⁵² Even the financial attractions of the Thomson Research Fund were now on the wane with the accelerating disappearance of secondary school selection, while Hudson's programme of "fundamental" research was aimed more at English and American backers than at SED whose interests were, in his eyes, too parochial and immediately pragmatic. His advent therefore not only brought great storms in Faculty and Senate but awoke the concerned interest of the Rector and the Students' Representative Council who pleaded caution over such an abrupt ending of a more clearly Scottish tradition of University Education studies.

Hudson's own account of the nature his first years in Edinburgh paint them in a highly combative light.¹⁵³ His imported students he regarded, says Delamont (who was one of them) as "an intellectual and social clique with considerable hostility to other schools of methodology" though she herself rejects this description. She labels Hudson's detailed analysis of the internal structure of the group as "highly inaccurate",¹⁵⁴ and elsewhere she protests that neither the students nor their subject matter were as divorced from their Scottish background as Hudson claimed.¹⁵⁵ He did, however, speed up the abandonment of the old Diploma and Degree. The first became firmly a College responsibility at last, the second, as was gradually becoming the case also in the other universities, a more highly specialised post-graduate Master's degree, far more like English models than the BEd/EdB it had succeeded except insofar as it preserved, perhaps, a greater taught and written examination element than was usual elsewhere and some relics at least of its Scottish generalist predecessor.¹⁵⁶ All these events thus make it difficult to link the Edinburgh Chair and courses of the 1970s to any continuous tradition. Though the problems of the relationship to Moray House remained, the EIS's vision of a Faculty and Drever's vision of a University Teachers College had been totally abandoned and the sole remaining 1876 chair was still seeking a role that was neither clearly defined nor generally recognised. "Hudson had found what to him was a paradise, but to Laurie and Meiklejohn had been a nightmare – a Chair without clear functions."¹⁵⁷

Throughout the late 60s and 70s those in the Universities anxious to preserve and develop the old degree structure with its high Psychology element, met annually at the Burn to see how far they could maintain a recognisable Scottish tradition of university activity, but even before Hudson's arrival, the cause seemed lost. Not only did the new MEd's with their options and specialisms increasingly reflect the strict disciplinary interests of departmental staff members far more than the old Bachelor degrees but the permission given to the new University of Stirling by the equally new General Teaching Council to provide teacher training in their undergraduate course, a right not likely to be accorded to their more long established colleagues, produced a major shock to uniformity. Stirling was fulfilling the hopes of Boyd and Laurie in a way that their successors continued to be forbidden to do, while the new teachers degree of BEd, almost entirely College-based, had caught the imagination of an EIS that in earlier decades would have seen it as professional dilution in the way they saw the similar option C in 1913. The EIS, in one sense the creator of the Chairs, did not even object to Hudson's innovations or to Dundee's suspension of Meiklejohn's chair. The Scottish debate had changed and the search for teacher status had moved elsewhere, to the new General Teaching Council and to the search for higher salaries, potentially more fruitful sources of professional advancement than any university connection, as Darroch had pointed out half a century earlier.

The Burn Conferences gave birth to one final, notable product of the earlier tradition, a serious academic journal designed as a vehicle for the wider dissemination of Scottish educational research findings generally and the work of the University Departments' staff and students in particular. The first issue of *Scottish Educational Studies* gave S. Nisbet an opportunity to survey the scene before Hudson's arrival.¹⁵⁸

He noted that there had been, in the wake of Robbins, yet another false dawn of the 1906 and 1924 variety, a general vision of University Schools of Education "in which Colleges, Universities, teacher-training, the (new) BEd, post-graduate study and research would all live happily and cooperative under one umbrella; but," he wrote,

"the dream faded quickly, leaving the dreamers a little pessimistic ..."

In fact it is doubtful if, this time round, the dream was based on solid negotiations anywhere but in Glasgow itself, where there had been some tentative discussions with Jordanhill College¹⁵⁹ but certainly the hope was never fulfilled. Trying to be optimistic, Nisbet saw in the expansion of university research of an "expanded and modernised" kind a chance to fire Scottish educators' imagination in the way that Boyd and Thomson "at the heart of the (New Education) movement" had done in the 20s and 30s. He did insist, however, that their success was a function of their generalism. In the work of the Departments, he maintained, the Philosophical element must remain compulsory: a degree in Education which equipped its students well with skill and knowledge but left them in (Plato's) cave would be unworthy of a university. Such a sentiment, likely to be as congenial to Pilley and Adams as to Laurie and Meiklejohn, was hardly likely however to command general respect in the education world of the 1970s and 80s, when specialism and the social sciences increasingly dominated educational thinking and a suitably strengthened College sector could do more to satisfy official needs than a Philosophy-based university course would ever do.

Writing two years after Nisbet, James Scotland, Principal of the Aberdeen College and himself an Historian and student of the generalist Rusk, asserted, apparently with enthusiasm, that "formal Philosophy and the Great Educators have (now) been supplanted by Sociology or at least the study of the community in which the child lives". In this article on teacher training, Scotland completely set aside the older universities' traditional or potential role, claiming that "a university no longer means a *universitas*" and that "the rigid patterns of the old Scottish degrees are breaking up ..."¹⁶⁰

Certainly generalism was ending. The new Glasgow MEd that replaced the EdB was to offer over 30 options to its students, some of them taught by College staff.

Such specialisation was clearly more easily catered for by large Colleges directly financed in accordance with SED needs. The three other, far smaller University departments, at the mercy of a UGC unused to the Scottish division of academic studies and teacher training, were hardly likely to be able to mount an adequate counter attack to the Colleges' expansion into many of the new fields, even if Glasgow, through greater student numbers, proved more successful at this than any of its three traditional colleagues.

By 1970 the search by all four Departments for a distinctive role and a secure existence seemed just as pressing as it had been 90 years earlier and for the same reason, the strength of a College sector backed by an efficient, highly centralised government department which traditionally mistrusted university independence as such. Without a profound change in the form of Scottish government and education, therefore, any surviving University Education Department, despite Nisbet's attempts at optimism, seemed likely to face the same problems for many years to come. The position had perhaps been put as clearly as it could be in an idiosyncratic, largely ignored piece of evidence given to McClelland in 1944 by the Association of County Councils,¹⁶¹ which totally rejected the currently fashionable call for Faculties of Education. Teaching, they said, was not in the same position as the other professions, inasmuch as education was a state service. The Training of Teachers, they claimed, was an integral part of the State education system and should not be managed by a private body such as a University Senatus. Even Struthers or the 1876 Lord Advocate could not have put the SED's case more clearly.

Boyd, in his evidence to the same Committee, declared that the Colleges had been raised to a high level of efficiency by the Department but that the time had come for it to demit office.... Their power to interfere in the smallest details of the college arrangements, even when rarely exercised, had, he said, "a bad effect on the spiritual life ..."¹⁶² Yet, as was abundantly clear, the SED's remit was not and never had been to safeguard the profession's spiritual life. As Struthers had spelt out on taking over

from Craik, his business was to control expenditure and the supply of teachers and to decide the form and content of their training. That now remained SED business. However much autonomy the Colleges were officially accorded or however many curriculum decisions were officially delegated to the new General Teaching Council, SED still controlled the purse strings and controlled the regulations for entry to teaching in the public sector. If a college stepped out of line, it could be financially starved or even closed. If the GTC made unsatisfactory rules governing registration, then registration could be deemed no longer compulsory in any given sector. But over the universities, SED had no such hold. University finance continued to be in the hands of a UGC reporting to a London ministry *ergo* their Education Departments' role in teacher education and in educational development generally must continue to be limited, just as it had been deliberately limited in 1876 and 1905-06.

So long as SED's main concerns had remained the administration of the school system and the training of teachers, the University Departments and SCRE had been excluded but had been left alone, when as McPherson puts it, "people like Boyd, Thomson, McClelland, Drever and Rusk operated in a world apart from the Department".¹⁶³ Such a situation, he believed, continued to the late 1950s. From then onwards the SED's concerns themselves expanded and began to overlap more and more with those of the University Departments, the world of research and high level specialised training. Insofar as SED demanded the same degree of control in that world as it demanded in the rest, then the consequences for those Departments were to be considerable. In 1969, J. Nisbet benignly noticed in an article on the new MED that SED had "greatly helped recruitment to the final stage by extending the undergraduate Student's Allowance for one year to selected students"¹⁶⁴ but such a power to give also implied the power to take away and the removal of SED support from Pilley's new two year degree was to have devastating results in one of the two large Departments. Control had been established and by the end of the 60s a part-time Edinburgh course, in line with SED financing, had had to be launched.

Even more crucial was the greater SED involvement in research. Not only did this involve a greater participation in the decisions and financial arrangements of SCRE but it also involved a considerable strengthening of the Colleges' position *vis a vis* the Universities. J. Nisbet again spoke positively of the "significant contribution to integration ... made by the policy of the Research and Intelligence Unit of SED to strengthen the research potential of the Colleges ... together with the location of the Curriculum Development Service within (them)"¹⁶⁵ but McPherson of Edinburgh University was more cautious. He feared that researchers outside SED "must pay a price for the growth of a professional research competence within it" and the expansion of its research interests had "been followed by a deterioration in the institutional counter-balance to the potential of such a system for harm".¹⁶⁶ He himself had felt the new threat - being told by an Inspector that he could "write what he liked" but that he "should not forget that Scotland was a small country" and had been called "a communist bent on dismantling authority" by an SED official because he proposed working on a collaborative model that involved the evaluation of government and other responses to his attempts to establish that model.¹⁶⁷

In such developments it is not difficult to discern that same official attitude which refused to help establish the 1876 Chair, which clipped the wings of the Provincial Committees, which abolished the Local Committees and the Schoolmaster's Diploma and which, above all, kept it out of university hands. If research was now important then SED should now try to control it insofar as it affected policy and the curriculum.¹⁶⁸ How far the University Departments can maintain true independence in such circumstances remains to be seen.

NOTES

1. See chapter 6 note 76.
2. Letter from Boyd to S. Nisbet 25 Nov 1950 (Clinic Coll) "When Rusk came on the scene he had no use for the Educational Clinic and in spite of the protests of the people who had worked it before his time, he made an end of it." Rusk rejected this (see chapter 9 below for a fuller account of the Clinic).
3. Though in view of the large number of students wishing to do the degree, a quota system had to operate (Glas C 19 Jun 1947).
4. Gardner in BQ interview. See also chapter 6 above.
5. Glas G C 5 Feb 1945. Aber C 26 Jul 49.
6. Association of Directors (1943) p 14.
7. McClelland Report (1946) p 59-61.
8. ED 8/52.T.125. (SRO).
9. McClelland Evidence ED 8/52/T.125 & T.98 (SRO).
10. The EIS in their evidence saw the Faculties essentially as organisations for awarding special first degrees, designed for teachers. Clearly, once the universities had shown a lack of enthusiasm, such a proposal collapsed (SRO ED 8/52.T.97).
11. The Labour party's commitment had appeared in a pamphlet as long ago as 1922 (*Scottish Educational Journal* 11 Apr 1924) and the Liberals, in their evidence to McClelland, emphasised that such faculties "would provide resources and personnel comparable to those available to educationists in the USA" (SRO ED 8/52A).
12. Letter of Hamilton Fyfe to McClelland 13 Jun 1945 in SRO ED 8/52A.
13. *Education in Scotland* 1949 p 51.
14. Glas C 19 Jun 1947. The numbers taking the degree in all three of the universities then offering it, increased considerably between 1945 and 1950. Graduates at Aberdeen in that period exceeded the number taking the degree during the entire inter-war period. See chapter 8 below.
15. Rusk (1960) p vi.
16. Rugg (1951) p 34.
17. Osborne (1966) makes this claim (p 99) which is substantiated by a BJEP survey discussed below in chapter 8.
18. Ford (1964) p 135.

19. The National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales was not founded until 1946.
20. St A C 9 Mar 1948.
21. Interview for BQ.
22. Thomson was chairman, Walker vice-chairman and both Skinner and Rusk were on the committee.
23. Nat Comm 11 Dec 1948.
24. Nat Comm 10 Dec 1949.
25. Nat Comm 12 May 1950.
26. Nat Comm 11 Dec 1948.
27. Nat Comm 12 Feb 1949.
28. Edin C 19 Feb 1951.
29. Edin C 19 Mar 1951.
30. Glas C 22 Mar 1951. Significantly Skinner of St Andrews had been the only staff member of any University Department of Education present at the meeting.
31. Edin C 22 Jan 1951.
32. Edin C 19 Feb 1951.
33. Edin P C 26 Feb 1951 reporting a meeting on 21 Feb.
34. Robbins Evidence p 1012.
35. Robbins Evidence p 1033.
36. *Journal of Education* Sep 1924. "The really serious drawback is that the Director/Professor gets a job which no man, however competent, can hope to fill properly". Difficulties had also been forecast by the *Scottish Educational Journal* which was worried that the Professor would have to neglect his major duty of conducting research (2 Jul 1926).
37. *Education in Scotland* 1951. Noting Thomson's retirement it claims that "both the universities and the training authorities had hoped that it might be found possible to continue the joint arrangement but, after full discussion of the difficulties arising from the greatly increased size and complexity of the university department as well as of the training centre, it was regrettably decided that two separate posts would be necessary".
38. Edin S 17 Oct 1951.
39. The phrase "lurking meanness" (Rich 1933 p 88) was considered appropriate by Cruickshank (1970) p 66 n to describe Laurie's

feelings about Normal Schools.

40. Knight (1902) p 51. Certainly the atmosphere of the Colleges at that period could be very strait-laced. The *Moray House Magazine* of 1901-02 p 4, commenting on its Glasgow contemporary confided that 'privately we consider that the sketch entitled "Jean McWhirter's Haulie'en Pairty" had better have been omitted. It is vulgar rather than humorous and "infra-dig" for a College magazine. The best ideas, we think, are the "Chronicles of the Cowcaddens" and the "Romance of a Tramway Car"'.
41. *Glasgow University Magazine* 13 Mar 1918. This article spoke of antagonism between honours students and the committee and the pettiness of staff attitudes.
42. *Glasgow University Magazine* 15 May 1929.
43. *New Dominie* Christmas 1938.
44. *Alma Mater* 28 Jan 1932.
45. *Glasgow University Magazine* 3 Dec 1930.
46. Association of Directors (1943) p 14. In their evidence to Robbins (p 1060) they recommended that the colleges should become wider institutions training more than one profession in order to produce "a leavening" and this view was reflected a year later in their evidence to McClelland PRO ED 8/52.T.96.
47. Wood (1964) in *Advancement of Science* Vol XX No 88 p 513.
48. Robbins Evidence p 1076.
49. *Ibid* p 1083.
50. *Ibid* p 162.
51. Quoted by Simpson (1954) p 115.
52. Gathorne-Hardy (1977) p 346.
53. SRO ED 8/52.T.98.
54. *New Dominie* Vol 5 No 2.
55. Robbins Evidence p 1050. This view was echoed by McClelland (another interested party) in his evidence to his own committee (PRO ED 8/52 T.14). It is one of many pieces of evidence that, unlike Thomson, he found his joint appointment making him steadily more pro-College and anti-University.
56. Charlton *et al.* (1960) p 162. Their conclusion: "The students who were the subjects of the present investigation ... were overwhelmingly of the opinion that the course of training was necessary and valuable".
57. McIntyre and Morrison (1967) p 34.

58. Scotland (1969b) notes (p 190) that whereas graduate students in college increased from 520 in 1954 to 1260 in 1967 (a rise of 142%) the number of women seeking the non-graduate primary qualification rose from 1750 to 6960 (a rise of 298%).
59. *Student* 7 May 1959.
60. Evidence from BQ.
61. *Student* 29 Nov 1957.
62. Letter from Inglis to University Secretary 7 Aug 1957 (Appendix Edin P C 20 Nov 1957).
63. *Student* 23 Jan 1958.
64. Quoted by Robertson (1964).
65. Macmurray (1939) p 116.
66. *Ibid.* p 164.
67. Quoted by Robertson in Nisbet and Kirk (1969) p 220.
68. Macmurray (1944) p 282.
69. As Dean of Arts, he had the main responsibility for making the appointment. There is no trace of competition or short-listing at least in the public Court Minutes.
70. Pilley (1957) p 136.
71. Clarke (1912) cited by Mitchell (1957) p 120.
72. Morris (1955) p 79.
73. Cottle and Sherborne (1959) pp 99-100.
74. See chapter 6 above.
75. Hinsdale (1900) describes, for example, the disputes surrounding the creation of the Michigan chair (recalling the Scotland of the 1870s) in which Payne had to assure the Normal School authorities that "the line between their work and ours is very distinct".
76. Brubacher (1947) p 515.
77. Letter to Adams 27 Jun 1963 "I am sorry to think that Aberdeen will be treading the statistical path".
78. Pilley (1958) p 283.
79. Boyd *Autob* p 199.
80. Quoted by Wilson in Bone (1967) p 231. No reference given.
81. Thomson emphasised this affluence when compared not only with

their English contemporaries but with the Scottish universities (SRO/ED8/52/T125).

82. Malcolm and Hunter (1948) p 29 in a brief sketch of Moray House had noted how Diploma and Degree students were "scattered to the four corners of the earth, (carrying) the good name of Edinburgh University and Moray House Training College with them".
83. Willey and Maddison (1971).
84. Lundgreen (1983) p 150.
85. Letter to Macmurray 12 Mar 1963.
86. For example in a letter dated 9 Nov 1961 "It is proposed that this Department be included and I don't like the idea at all. I would prefer to be established in a Department of anti-Social Science".
87. Letter to Hamilton 3 Oct 1962.
88. Letter to Mackinnon 30 Oct 1962.
89. Letter to University Secretary 8 Feb 1962.
90. BQ evidence.
91. E.g. in a letter to the Editorial Office of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 19 Mar 1963.
92. Vernon (1957) p 17.
93. T R F papers.
94. Letter to *Encyclopaedia Britannica op cit*
95. Robbins Evidence p 162. There was, he said, "no need to succumb to a foolishly grandiose conception of what the training of graduates involved".
96. *University of Edinburgh Gazette* May 1958.
97. Robbins Evidence p 1050.
98. *Moray House Magazine* 1953.
99. ADE Conference Report 1943.
100. Vernon (1957) p 25.
101. The creation of the fund actually pre-dated Thomson's arrival in Edinburgh (Evidence to the Consultative Committee, quoted by Sutherland (1977)) and Moray House seems to have been entitled to a share in its running and of its expenditure. As late as 30 Jan 1952, the Edin P C minutes record the appointment of the Director of Studies as an *ex officio* trustee of the fund "so that educational research undertaken by both bodies (University and Moray House College) could be integrated".

102. BQ interview with Miss Young who had been Thomson's assistant on his arrival in Edinburgh.
103. Edin P C 18 Apr 1951.
104. Edin P C 30 Jan 1952.
105. Edin P C 18 Apr 1951.
106. Robbins Evidence p 162 "Over the years," he said, "the hostility of College staffs to this arrangement has found expression in such to individual students and even at times to classes ..."
107. Letter to Inglis 23 Jan 1958 provided in Edin P C 12 Feb 1958 "I am writing to tell you that our University representatives do not accept your letter as a correct record of the business of the meeting with which it purports to deal."
108. Edin P C 6 Mar 1958 gives, in an Appendix, a detailed report of this meeting of the joint negotiating committee.
109. Though this was opposed by Skinner who put up a vigorous defence of the Scottish Diploma in the *Year Book of Education* for 1953, p 175.
110. Elvin (1963) p 14, himself a member of the Robbins committee summed up their aspiration. "It is also hoped that in Scotland the universities and the colleges may draw closer together."
111. In fact, despite his reputation as a statistically based researcher, and test constructor, McClelland was internationally known as a leading progressive figure in the New Education Fellowship and had helped Boyd to organise their annual conference at St. Andrews in 1935 (*New Era* Aug 1935).
112. Nat Comm 4 Jun 1954. In the proportions of £1500 from the National Committee and £900 from the University.
113. Letter from St. Andrews Court quoted in Nat Comm 9 Oct 1954.
114. Nat Comm 9 Oct 1954. This gives added evidence to the same reason in the Edinburgh case, as the Moray House duties were far greater, though here again it may be an agreed euphemistic formula to disguise financial disagreements.
115. Tedder p 75.
116. Tedder p 16.
117. Cooper p 5.
118. *Saltire* 1 Nov 1950. In fact it was only Education and Law students who faced daily travel over the dozen or so miles between St. Andrews and Dundee (Tedder p 16).
119. Cooper p 14. According to evidence to McClelland, the system had almost died out in Edinburgh by 1944 (2 graduates, according to

Thomson) and had become impossible in Glasgow. However in Aberdeen it was still flourishing (120 out of 300 graduates). No figures were given for St. Andrews. ED 8/52/T.125 (SRO).

120. Tedder p 14.
121. Tedder p 16.
122. Tedder p 22. Had it materialised it would have required a sizeable amount of Arts teaching in Dundee.
123. Tedder p 22. Shafe (1982) p 109.
124. Shafe p 125. He notes, however, that "the atmosphere cleared slightly" when the new Director of the Training Centre was appointed to a part-time post in the University Department by Adams, the new professor.
125. See chapter 6.
126. Glas C 18 Nov 1937. There had been some attempts then to link its creation to the forthcoming Empire exhibition at Bellahouston, just as the profits of a previous Glasgow exhibition had helped to endow the chair of Scottish History and Literature. *Scottish Educational Journal* 31 Dec 1937.
127. Glas C 14 Dec 1942.
128. This was the firm conviction of both Smith and Inglis in BQ interviews. It may be of significance that Hetherington was not present at the farewell presentation to Boyd, along with Tom Johnston, the Secretary of SED and the Lord Provost. See chapter 6.
129. Boyd and the Senate were in open conflict before McClelland on the subject of an undergraduate teacher's degree. ED 8/52/T57 (SRO).
130. Ironically, however, members were to fall dramatically for a time once the chair had been filled - to 6 in 1955 and 7 in 1956.
131. Hetherington (1953) p 15 who saw the business of teachers (*inter alia*) as being "to apply science" to their task in society.
132. Glas C 21 Feb 1946.
133. Glas C 21 Mar 1946.
134. Glas C 15 May 1947.
135. Glas C 23 Oct 1947.
136. Glas C 15 Apr 1948. By now these amounted to £2,059-15-7. Instead they were used to endow a Boyd Prize.
137. Glas C 24 Mar 1949.

138. Glas C 23 Mar 1950.
139. "Contact was friendly but by no means close ... There was a twenty minute bus run between them" SRO ED 8/52 T.125.
140. BQ interview with Walker, who also detected a thaw following the disappearance of Butcher, the University Secretary, who had had particularly bad relations with the College.
141. Aber C 1 Sep 1947.
142. Aber Sen 20 Dec 1950.
143. E.g. Aber G C 1 Jul 1950 & 7 Jul 1951.
144. Aber G C 2 Jul 1960.
145. Boyd Autob p 386.
146. Letter to Landells, the donor. 23 Feb 1962.
147. *Edinburgh University Bulletin* Nov 1965 outlines the procedure whereby, when a chair becomes vacant, its future existence is discussed. This procedure was followed in the case of Education on Pilley's retirement.
148. In the presence of the author.
149. An invitation declined at a meeting with members of the department 21-22 Feb 1968. Eventually it was temporarily changed during his tenure to "Educational Sciences".
150. The title he chose for an article in which he detailed his Edinburgh policy. Hudson (1977).
151. Hudson (1977) p 89.
152. Quoted by Hamilton (1985a).
153. Hudson (1977) *passim*
154. Delamont (1984a) p 18.
155. In Dockrell (1984) p 35 "the product of their studies is an important body of information on Scottish educational procedures of the period 1968-74"; p 38 "The Edinburgh Department under Hudson, despite his views, was actually contributing to our knowledge of Scots education."
156. Hamilton (1985a) claims that "the English model ... master's degree irrevocably shaped the educational research of the 1970s, just as the Scottish post-graduate ... degree had done so in the preceding half century".
157. Bell (1983) p 170.
158. *Scottish Educational Studies* Vol 1 No 1 Jun 1967 p 8.

159. BQ discussions with staff members.
160. Scotland (1969b) p 201.
161. SRO ED 8/52 T.99.
162. SRO ED 8/52 T.83.
163. McPherson (1985) p 11 in circulated typescript.
164. Nisbet (1969) p 11.
165. Nisbet in Dockrell (1984) p 4.
166. McPherson in Dockrell (1984) pp 121-2.
167. *Ibid.* p 117-8.
168. In this may also lie one, though only one explanation of why SED tolerated the joint appointments of 1925, which, though they gave the Universities some control of College affairs, gave SED far more control over the finances and working conditions of two professors noted for their research interests.

CHAPTER 8

THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEGREE

The Bachelor of Education degree conceived in Edinburgh by Drever and Darroch and adopted as a model by the other three universities has subsequently become celebrated as a major influence not only in the development of Scottish psychology and educational studies but in the development of Scottish education generally, and those discussing its history usually do so with considerable enthusiasm. Hearnshaw, in his standard history of British psychology speaks of it as 'promoting and shaping' the course of Scottish psychology¹ while J. Nisbet speaks of its 'considerable standing in the educational world'.² Inglis in an obituary of Boyd speaks of 'the great company of those who took his advanced classes',³ making it clear that he is not just thinking of their number, while J. Sutherland in an obituary claims that, in the final reckoning, it may well be Thomson's BEd students 'that will be his final memorial'.⁴ All of them talk of how BEd/EdB students have moved into positions of leadership, Inglis, for example, talking of 'distinguished headmasters, inspectors of schools, directors of education, professors and heads of colleges' and certainly holders of the degree were (and are) to be found in the upper ranks of all the educational professions. According to J. Nisbet, 16 became professors, a category of university staff much thinner on the ground when he made his calculation in 1965 than subsequently, and he saw them as evidence of a victory in what he called the "long struggle (of Education) for recognition as a respectable academic discipline".⁵ Indeed such is the respectful, almost hagiographical tone adopted by Scottish educationists when writing of the degree and its early teachers that one graduate, a mere RAF education officer, told BQ that as far as his contemporaries on the EdB course were concerned, he "might as well now be playing a piano in a house of shame".

Table 1, based on responses to BQ⁶ provides a list of some of the honours conferred on degree-holders that go beyond the titles conferred merely by career structures, showing how far the position of educational professionals really had

advanced since Gibson's lament in 1885 that teachers were always neglected when public honours were being distributed.⁷

At the same time any remarkable display of enthusiasm must always beg scepticism and if the degree was so much of a pioneer, so uniquely successful and if holding of it *was* such a mark of leadership, it is surprising to find, for example, that so few graduates achieved the relatively common status of Fellow of the Educational Institute of Scotland.

Moreover, while all the distinguished alumni listed in Table 1 were undoubtedly holders of the degree it is of course impossible to demonstrate how far such distinctions and awards were a consequence of their taking this particular degree course rather than merely a function of earlier and later experience and training not to mention their own personal qualities. Much the same comment must also be made on the impressive total of graduates occupying chairs, headships and other teaching posts. Indeed a number (albeit a small minority) of distinguished graduates in responding to BQ were themselves extremely sceptical about the degree's professional usefulness. One well-known professor for example (included in the total of sixteen to which Nisbet draws attention) stated that he regarded the degree's content as "negligible", the only value of the course being the formal one of giving him entry to "a decent PhD university".

In any case, as Appendix A warns, there must be caution about any such general celebration of a degree awarded in four different universities over a period of fifty years. Comments on the nature and influence of the full-time degree in Edinburgh during the 1940s are not necessarily valid for the part-time degree at Glasgow in the 1920s or for both men and women, and while there was always a genuine attempt to keep demands in line and to make the preliminary Diploma, for example, interchangeable between the four universities, the differences in teaching and subject development under different heads of department in different centres must always

Table 1

Knighthoods	1
C.B.E.	6
O.B.E.	6
Honorary Doctorates	7
President of the British Psychological Society	1
President of Canadian Psychological Association	1
President of the Association of Psychiatric Social Workers	1
President of the Mental Health Association	1
President of the Scottish Sunday School Union	1
Civil Service Commissioner	1
* * * * *	
Fellows of the British Psychological Society	14
Fellows of the Educational Institute of Scotland	11
Fellows of the Royal Society of Edinburgh	3
Fellows of the Royal Geographical Society	2
Fellows of the Royal Society of Arts	2
Fellows of the International Council of Psychologists	2
Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada	1
Fellow of the Canadian Psychological Association	1
Fellow of the Royal Economics Society	1
Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland	1

have been considerable. It is noteworthy also that the initial development of the degree, especially outside Edinburgh, was never spectacular. It took three of the four universities some years to produce any graduates at all (in the case of St. Andrews, thirty years) and even in Edinburgh its significance and its relevance to the needs of Scottish education were by no means immediately recognised. Many of the early students there came from outwith Scotland and left immediately after graduation,⁸ and throughout the 20s and 30s the numbers even in the two large universities, remained very small compared with what were to be the post-1945 levels (see Tables 2 and 3) though, as Simpson has shown, they might well have seemed quite healthy by the general standards of British post-graduate education at that time. She points out that, whereas by 1983, 13% of all British university students were graduates, in 1938 the proportion was only 6% and most of these were English and Welsh Grammar School teachers in training.⁹ Even so, early advocates of the degree, looking to American models, had no doubt expected numbers much larger and on a similar scale to the advanced professional training classes in Columbia and Chicago. Indeed, such an expectation must explain the time spent by Principals, Courts and Senates in launching the degree. The disappointed Scottish correspondent of the *Journal of Education*, noting in 1922¹⁰ that an Edinburgh holder of BEd had for the first time proceeded to a PhD, expressed his surprise that Glasgow 'with hundreds of education students' at the undergraduate level, could not persuade them to undertake advanced studies by way of the new degree. The truth was, however, that it had caught the imagination of neither the teaching profession nor the authorities as a modern and convenient way of selecting and training leaders.

This was particularly true in the potentially expanding field of educational administration, as we shall see in the next chapter and even if one allows that the university departments' own enthusiasms in the 20s and 30s were directed more towards clinics and mental testing than towards administrative questions, there is evidence that even in such fields their influence on local authorities was less than

Table 2

Scottish Education Graduates
1918-1945

Number Graduating in	Edinburgh			Glasgow			Aberdeen		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
1918	1	2	3						
1919		2	2						
1920	3	2	5						
1921	2	1	3				2		2
1922	3	4	7	1		1	1		1
1923	5	2	7	1	1	2			
1924	1	1	2		1	1			
1925	2		2	1	2	3			
1926	4	2	6	2	1	3			
1927	4		4	2	1	3			
1928	9	2	11	2		2	1		1
1929	2	4	6	3	1	4	1		1
1930	7	1	8	1	3	4			
1931	2		2	7		7			
1932	2	1	3	4		4			
1933	2	2	4	3		3		1	1
1934	3	1	4	2	1	3	1		1
1935	2	1	3	8	1	9			
1936	5	2	7	4	2	6	1		1
1937	5	3	8	5	2	7		1	1
1938	4	4	8	3	2	5	3		3
1939	8	5	13	14		14	2		2
1940	6	4	10	6	3	9	2		2
1941	1	2	3	1	5	6			
1942				1	3	4			
1943	1	2	3	1	1	2		2	2
1944	1		1	3	4	7	1	1	2
1945	1	1	2		11	11	1	1	2
Total	86	51	137	75	45	120	16	6	22

M - Male
F - Female

Table 3

Scottish Education Graduates
1946-1966

Number Graduating in	Edinburgh			Glasgow			Aberdeen			St Andrews		
	M	F	Tot	M	F	Tot	M	F	Tot	M	F	Tot
1946	3	4	7	5	11	16	1	1	2			
1947	14	2	16	6	12	18	3		3			
1948	5	5	10	15	7	22	4	2	6			
1949	7	1	8	21	7	28	3	2	5			
1950	7	2	9	20	9	29	4	1	5	2	4	6
1951	12	2	14	21	12	33	4	3	7	6	1	7
1952	5	1	6	22	2	24	5		5	7	1	8
1953	5	2	7	10	5	15	6		6	8		8
1954	3	2	5	5	2	7	5	2	7	4		4
1955	8	1	9	4	2	6	5	2	7	3		3
1956	6	1	7	7		7	9		9	2	1	3
1957	10	1	11	6	3	9	6		6	2		2
1958	5	1	6	8	4	12	8	2	10			
1959	4		4	5	1	6	1		1	1		1
1960	3	2	5	3	1	4	2	2	4	3	1	4
1961	5	3	8	9	2	11		3	3	4	1	5
1962	2		2	11	1	12	5	2	7	1	1	2
1963	1	1	2	2	1	3	7	1	8	3		3
1964		2	2	13	3	16	3		3	1		1
1965	2	2	4	10	4	14	6	3	9	4		4
1966	2		2	11	2	13	5	4	9	4		4
Total	109	35	144	214	91	305	92	30	122	55	10	65

M - Males

F - Females

Tot - Total

might have been expected. For example, although Boyd and Drever had opened their clinics as early as 1925 and had fully involved their students in such work, by 1938 there were still only 11 such clinics in the whole of Scotland and only one of those was provided by an education authority.

Even the joint founding of the Scottish Council for Research in Education in 1928 by the EIS and the local authorities, in which Boyd and Thomson both played a leading part, did not result in any mass employment of university trained researchers by the local authorities. Indeed, the mere existence of SCRE seems to have excused them from mounting much research themselves just as the existence of large, nationally financed Colleges had enabled them to avoid the teacher-training task expensively undertaken by the English LEAs. What specialist work *was* required locally was usually either farmed out to local university or college staff or ignored completely. This followed the early pattern in England where Thomson, for example, had been given the opportunity to develop his celebrated Northumberland tests, not as the employee of Northumberland Education Committee but on contract, as a consultant from a university department.¹¹ No doubt such a distancing of researchers may well have been preferred by local politicians, whose interests were often more sectarian than educational and who were often sufficiently conservative to want to avoid identifying their authority with too many new and to them, "faddist" experiments. Certainly many of them might not have wanted to give New Educationists such as Boyd and McClelland too much control over public funds and only when later university-trained figures like McIntosh, director in Fife, were able to convince them that the holding of a BEd could go hand in hand with efficient and economical management, could a widespread welcoming of such graduates inaugurate a larger scale launching of research programmes within the authorities themselves.

Such caution may also explain the long delay in the launching of local authority psychology services compared with those in England, even though Scotland was far ahead in producing suitable graduates and indeed was supplying most of the early

recruits for the English services.¹² The truth was that so long as the universities and colleges could supply the clinics, and the necessary staff, as well as the necessary infrastructure and below-the-line expenses for research the authorities were happy to leave them to it. They could thus happily concentrate on helping to finance, and thus in part to control, educationally 'safer' research ventures under the auspices of SCRE, such as the national surveys, which apparently posed no immediate challenges to specifically local arrangements and prejudices.

In a similar way G. Sutherland notes how the employment of Thomson's Moray House testing service (as opposed to the direct employment of his graduates) 'could remove much, even all of the process of examining from the hothouse arena of local politics and vested interests' as well as being 'relatively cheap'.¹³

Nor was the teaching profession that had fought so hard to have the education degree established, necessarily more receptive to what the University Departments had to say on such issues as psychology and testing, for example. Speaking to a world conference of the New Education Fellowship at Elsinore in 1929, Boyd admitted that Scottish teachers had been 'very slow to take up the idea and practice of tests. The best that (could) be said (was) that there seemed to be a growing interest. It is doubtful,' he said, 'whether as many as 5% of teachers know anything about testing',¹⁴ a claim borne out by the ignorance of A. S. Neill's preposterous assertion in 1936 that educational (or indeed any form of) psychology had still to reach Scotland¹⁵ though three years later, in Columbia, Boyd had to comment 'with shame on the fact that outside the sphere of mental deficiency there (was) not a single *school* psychologist in Scotland'.¹⁶ "With us," he said, "the test movement has always been something exotic ... it has remained something of a curiosity that does not matter much to anybody".¹⁷ Even in the 1950s, when the degree's fame and influence were at their height and Thomson had been installed in Edinburgh for twenty five years, a leading East Lothian headmaster could still warn a general audience in a popular magazine that 'intelligence tests ... should be kept very much in their place and used very

infrequently'.¹⁸

When, in the 1930s, Scottish writers such as Rusk and Kennedy-Fraser dealt with recent developments in Scottish mental testing, they did not consider it worth mentioning the influence of the degree as an element in the current situation¹⁹ and the celebration of that influence, in any context, seems to have been unknown before 1939 and more a function of its post-war expansion, when mental testing and new and more scientifically based forms of educational management began to acquire a more obvious role in the politics of Scottish schooling.

Even so, the evidence of Lumsden and others, to be discussed below, makes it clear that Scottish graduates did play a crucial part before the war in the development of the English educational psychology service, even if, in a 1956 UNESCO survey of the growth of that service, Wall could still, with questionable accuracy, speak of Burt's work in Liverpool and London 'being so successful that similar methods were adopted in other areas ... such as Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen'.²⁰ while Burt himself, though an admirer of the Edinburgh degree, which he externally examined, could not cite any specific examples of its English influence when approached by the author, and could only write in very general terms of 'higher Scottish standards'.²¹ Moreover Burt appears to have been rather surprised at finding any such standards north of the Border other than in Thomson's Edinburgh, judging from the patronising tone he adopted towards the test construction of Boyd who was told that the commentary accompanying one set of tests was, "contrary to expectation ... a convincing job".²²

A few BQ respondents were indeed ready to admit that the standing of the degree even in Scotland had never been universally high and that its influence, except in some specific instances, was strictly limited. While the majority of respondents held very positive views about its status, or had no special views, over a hundred felt that it was regarded sceptically by other professionals, that its academic reputation was suspect or that that reputation had 'gone down' (usually after their period at a

particular university). Certainly in their detailed comments on the standard and scope of the teaching and particularly in their assessment of the research-training, they showed considerably less confidence in the degree's quality than might be assumed from Nisbet's celebratory articles or the obituaries on Boyd and Thomson.

Yet even many of those making negative comments on the course as a form of scientific training were still prepared to say that, for them personally it had been a 'worthwhile experience'. Indeed, 94.2% of all BQ respondents were prepared to say so, with similar responses never dropping lower than 92.1% (Glasgow post-1950 students) for any particular grouping. In the case of Aberdeen graduates, it even rises to 97.5%.

The enthusiastic writers quoted at the beginning of the chapter were all themselves holders of the degree and it may be that it is in this emotional commitment to the course that the secret of the enduring BEd/EdB myth seems to lie, for these appreciation scores would be remarkably high for any academic course mounted over such a long period in so many institutions under such a varied collection of teachers. The degree is therefore a phenomenon of some interest in its own right especially as it formed the major contribution to the educational system of a set of University Departments far from universally held in high regard by the outside world or even by university colleagues.

Using BQ as a guide, therefore,²³ with all the provisos contained in Appendix A, we now examine the development of the degree and its student body from its origins in the first war's Ordinances until it was replaced by a very different MEd largely as a consequence of the Robbins Report's introduction of the new undergraduate BEd in the late 1960s.

1. The Course

The BEd/EdB, technically speaking, was not a higher degree in the traditional Scottish sense but an honours degree²⁴ completed at post-graduate level and officially consisting of two stages.

The first was the *Diploma* course. In the early years this was often identical with either the undergraduate courses in education and psychology or the special theory courses for graduate trainees provided in the Colleges, though in such cases a higher standard of performance was usually demanded of Diploma candidates.²⁵

Whatever its form, the Diploma course was usually taken alongside the technical teacher-training course in a local college and, in later years, students opting to take the different and supposedly more demanding University Diploma classes, were given exemption from the equivalent graduate courses provided by the college for students in training.²⁶ The holding of an equivalent teacher training qualification from a recognised non-Scottish university usually gave exemption from the Diploma stage, though all graduates from Scottish universities except those with major teaching experience, had usually also taken the Diploma at a Scottish university.

In the early days, the situation was confused by the fact that many students completed most of their teacher-training course while still undergraduates (the so-called 'concurrent' arrangement). This meant that, in certain circumstances, the taking of appropriate undergraduate courses could mean that the Diploma was earned alongside a first degree. Thus Jennie Lee, for example, claims to have earned an MA, an LLB, and an Education Diploma as well as a Teachers Certificate all from the same four and a half years of courses in the early 1920s.²⁷ As a result of such complexities, many BQ respondents were unaware or hardly aware of ever having followed a Diploma course at all and certainly for many years in Glasgow, no separate Diploma document seems to have been sent to students, while at Aberdeen the award of a separate diploma was not even officially authorised until 1926,²⁸ in other words quite

late in the degree's history. In Edinburgh, on the other hand, the Diploma, as an award, predated the degree Ordinance and was always seen as a quite separate qualification, rather than simply the first stage of the BEd, something that was even more obviously true at St. Andrews where the second stage of the degree course was not even launched until some twenty years after the award of the first Diploma.

Even so, the Diploma was always widely seen as providing a pool of graduates capable of being attracted into the degree course proper. S. Nisbet suggests that if over 300 graduates a year had "not been so introduced during their compulsory training year to education and psychology as academic subjects ... (they) would hardly have been likely to enrol later as candidates for a post-graduate degree in education".²⁹

The second stage of the course, the *advanced or graduation* section, was the only part with which the BQ survey was seriously concerned. It usually lasted for one academic year or 2-3 part-time years, though in Edinburgh, where part-time study was never officially allowed, the full-time course was eventually lengthened to two years in 1960. At certain stages of the degree's history, the psychology and education components, which were both meant to play a major part in every student's course, were not available concurrently in either St. Andrews or Aberdeen, thus making full-time study impossible. In Glasgow, however, full and part-time courses were always available.

2. The students

Graduates at all periods and in all four universities, were predominantly male, as Tables 2 and 3 make clear, though this predominance is less marked in the pre-1945 period at both Edinburgh and Glasgow. During that period in both cases females formed over one third of the graduates, a much higher proportion than in the comparable professional degrees of LLB and MB. Such a high female representation had been a feature of earlier Education courses in all four universities but nowhere did

it survive the post-war influx of ex-servicemen and the professional developments of the 50s and 60s, falling to less than a quarter in the case of Edinburgh and St. Andrews.³⁰

The inferior and deteriorating position of women so far as this degree is concerned becomes even more striking when examined against their position in the Arts faculties from which most BEd/EdB students were drawn, for, as Tables 3a and 3b indicate, women Arts graduates actually outnumbered men in Edinburgh at both the beginning and the end of the period under review, while in Glasgow, there was little to choose between the two. Only in the immediate post-war years, as a result of the demobilisation bulge, did male Arts graduates predominate.

It would seem therefore that some factor other than general university disability, eventually depressed female participation on the BEd/EdB course. As BQ was concerned only with successful participants, it can tell us little, though the supposition must be that the investment of time and money in further years of professional study did not in the eyes of many potential students, seem likely to pay off in a group of professions where the promotion of women was still slow or non-existent, even in the Scottish school sector itself.

It is certain also that the exigencies of the course were a deterrent to married women. Despite the advanced average age of students, 94.3% of all female students were unmarried and only 4 (3.3%) had any children at the time. The exclusion of married women from teaching posts (including posts in psychology) for much of the period must also have had a considerable effect.

The mean age at the time of graduation, at least among respondents to BQ, was 29.6 (see Table 4) with a comparatively narrow range of variations from that mean among the different groupings, the lowest being 27.8 for Glasgow full-time students and the highest 31.9 for part-timers there, reflecting perhaps the greater length of the part-time course. Given the part-time nature of the course for so many students, this

Table 3a First Degree Arts Graduates in Edinburgh.

		1929-30	1939-40	1949-50	1959-60
<u>Overall</u>		+	+	+	+
Male		150 (39.6)	86 (45.8)	306 (59.0)	214 (49.7)
Female		229 (60.4)	102 (54.2)	213 (41.0)	217 (50.3)
A	Total	379	188	519	431
<u>Honours</u>		*	*	*	*
Male		61 (52.1)	26 (56.5)	155 (65.4)	101 (59.4)
Female		56 (47.9)	20 (43.5)	82 (34.6)	69 (40.6)
B	Total	117 (30.9)	46 (24.5)	237 (45.7)	170 (39.4)
<u>Ordinary</u>		x	x	x	x
Male		89 (34.0)	60 (42.3)	151 (53.5)	113 (43.3)
Female		173 (66.0)	82 (57.7)	131 (46.5)	148 (56.7)
C	Total	262 (69.1)	142 (75.5)	282 (54.3)	261 (60.6)

Source: Edin. Calendar

+ percentage of total A

* percentage of total B

x percentage of total C

Table 3b First Degree Arts Graduates in Glasgow.

		1929-30	1939-40	1949-50	1959-60
<u>Overall</u>		+	+	+	
Male		280 (48.8)	216 (56.8)	227 (53.7)	190 (52.2)
Female		294 (51.2)	164 (43.2)	196 (46.3)	174 (47.8)
A	Total	574	380	423	364
<u>Honours</u>		*	*	*	*
Male		78 (69.6)	82 (70.1)	58 (60.4)	81 (73.0)
Female		34 (30.4)	35 (29.9)	38 (39.6)	30 (27.0)
B	Total	112 (19.5)	117 (30.8)	96 (22.7)	111 (30.5)
<u>Ordinary</u>		x	x	x	
Male		202 (43.7)	134 (51.0)	169 (51.7)	109 (43.1)
Female		260 (56.3)	129 (49.0)	158 (48.3)	144 (56.9)
C	Total	462 (80.5)	263 (69.2)	327 (77.3)	253 (69.5)

Source: Glas. Calendar

+ percentage of A

* percentage of B

x percentage of C

Table 4

Age at graduation.

	20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	50+	No Info	Mean
Aberdeen	33	24	14	6	2				27.9
Belfast	11	16	8	5	2				28.7
Edinburgh pre-1950	19	14	10	9	1				28.9
Edinburgh post-1950	24	23	15	4	3				29.7
Edinburgh total	43	37	25	13	4				28.7
Glasgow pre-1950	28	27	29	13	6	1			30.2
Glasgow post-1950	10	43	33	11	10	3		3	31.9
Glasgow full-time	12	8	7	2	1			1	27.8
Glasgow part-time	24	61	55	21	15	4	1		32
Glasgow total	38	70	62	24	16	4	1	3	30.8
St Andrews	21	12	11	3	3		2		29.3
Male	105	113	83	33	16		1	1	29.1
Female	35	34	24	15	8	3	2	2	30.6
Total	146	159	120	51	27	4		3	29.6

age range does not seem exceptional. In their general survey of contemporary British post-graduate students, Rudd and Simpson (1975) found that 52% of part-timers were over 30 and a further 29% over 25.³¹

Individual ages recorded by BQ ranged from 146 in the 20-25 years age group to 3 students of 50+, though this last figure may well be an underestimate. In the early days there appear to have been an appreciable number of older candidates (the first Glasgow candidate, for example, was 54) and many of these graduates were, of course, dead by the time of BQ.

The majority of students at all four universities had taken their first degree at a Scottish university - 88.1% - see Table 5. At Glasgow this was true of 97.2% while 88.5% were actual Glasgow graduates. Figures were also high at St. Andrews and Aberdeen (84.6% and 93.5% respectively) though the former attracted a smaller proportion of its own graduates (63.5%) while, in Edinburgh, though the majority *were* Scottish graduates, the figure was appreciably less (68.6%) while only 57.6% had taken their first degree in Edinburgh. This again may be an underestimate in view of the fact that so many Edinburgh BEds either originated outside Britain, sometimes in countries with low life expectation, or went overseas at graduation, thus making them more difficult for BQ to trace (see Appendix A).

Edinburgh certainly provided the largest number of respondents with a first degree taken elsewhere in the British Isles, 17.8% compared with Glasgow's 0.9%,³² while Edinburgh's proportion from elsewhere in the world was 13.6% compared with Glasgow's 1.8%, reflecting what had from the beginning of the century been an Edinburgh characteristic. As early as 1910, Anderson notes, 20% of all Edinburgh students were from overseas,³³ so that the BEd proportion was by no means unusual.

As Table 6 demonstrates, the taking of the Diploma seems to have been a more important factor in attracting students to a particular university than the taking of a first degree there though it is, of course important to remember that for over twenty

Table 5

University of first degree related to university
at which education degree awarded.
(percentages in brackets, Belfast not included)

University at which B.Ed/Ed.B awarded	Aberdeen	Edinburgh	Glasgow	St Andrews	All Four Universities
University of First Degree					
Aberdeen	60(77.9)	3(2.5)	2(0.9)	2(3.9)	
Edinburgh	7(9.0)	68(57.6)	6(2.8)	7(13.7)	
Glasgow	2(2.6)	1(0.8)	192(88.5)	2(3.9)	
St Andrews	3(3.9)	9(7.6)	11(5.1)	33(63.5)	
Scotland total	72(93.5)	81(68.6)	211(97.2)	44(84.6)	408(88.1)
Belfast		1(0.8)			
Dublin - T.C.D.	2(2.5)	3(2.5)			
Dublin - U.C.D.		1(0.8)			
Ireland total	2(2.5)	5(4.2)			7(1.5)
Wales		4(3.4)		2(3.9)	6(1.3)
Bristol		1(0.8)	1(0.5)	1(2.0)	
Cambridge		4(3.4)		1(2.0)	
Durham	1(1.3)	2(1.7)			
London		4(3.4)	1(0.5)		
Manchester		1(0.8)			
Oxford				2(3.9)	
Reading	1(1.3)				
Sheffield	1(1.3)				
England total	3(3.9)	12(10.1)	2(0.9)	4(7.8)	21(4.5)
South Africa		1(0.8)			
India		6(5.0)	1(0.5)		
Canada		2(1.7)			
Singapore					
West Indies			1(0.5)		
Australia				1(2.0)	
New Zealand			1(0.5)		
Greece		7(5.9)			
Germany			1(0.5)		
Outside Scotland total	5(6.5)	37(31.4)	6(2.8)	7(13.7)	55(11.9)
Outside British Isles total	0	16(13.6)	4(1.8)	1(2.0)	21(4.5)
Elsewhere in British Isles	5(6.5)	21(17.8)	2(0.9)	6(11.8)	34(7.3)

Table 6 University at which Diploma or its equivalent was awarded.

<div> <div>B.Ed/Ed.B University</div> <div>Diploma University</div> </div>	Aberdeen	Edinburgh	Glasgow	St Andrews	All Four Universities
Aberdeen	62(82.7)			1(1.9)	
Edinburgh	4(5.4)	85(70.8)	7(3.3)	4(7.7)	
Glasgow	2(2.7)		198(93.4)	1(1.9)	
St Andrews	3(4.0)	10(8.3)	6(2.8)	43(82.7)	
Scotland total	71(94.7)	95(79.2)	211(99.5)	49(94.2)	426(92.8)
Belfast		1(0.8)			
Dublin - T.C.D.	2(2.7)	6(5.0)			
Dublin - U.C.D.		1(0.8)			
Ireland total	2(2.7)	8(6.7)			10(2.2)
Wales total		4(3.4)			4(0.9)
Cambridge		4(3.4)		1(1.9)	
Durham		2(1.7)			
Exeter		1(0.8)			
Leeds		1(0.8)			
London	1(1.4)	5(4.2)	1(0.5)	1(1.9)	
Sheffield	1(1.4)				
England total	2(2.7)	13(10.8)	1(0.5)	2(3.8)	18(3.9)
Australia				1(1.9)	
Outside Scotland total	4(5.4)	25(20.8)	1(0.5)	3(5.8)	33(7.2)

years in St. Andrews, only the Diploma course was available. At Edinburgh there was an appreciable influx of non-Scottish Diploma holders (20.8%) while in Glasgow 93.4% had actually taken the Diploma in the same university.

Under the regulations, candidates did not *have* to be trained teachers. Normally evidence of three or more years of successful teaching was accepted as sufficient. Even so, 81% of respondents had actually received teacher-training in a Scottish college, while almost all of the remainder had undergone some form of formal training outwith Scotland.

50.5% of students covered by BQ had decided to take the degree before embarking on the Diploma course, with almost a quarter (24.4%) deciding to do so during that stage. Early decision-making was particularly prevalent in pre-1950 Glasgow (78.9% before the Diploma) but such a high figure may be the result of the confusion over the existence of the Glasgow Diploma noted earlier.

Early decision-making also seems to have been reasonably common in Aberdeen (54.4% before the Diploma) and in later years it seems to have become increasingly common for these students to have progressed from first degree to EdB with little interruption.

Judging from responses to an open-ended question on the standing of the course, there was a common assumption at the time of BQ that the BEd/EdB, a post-graduate honours degree, was often taken as a way of compensating for a poor first degree, thus opening up to Ordinary graduates the salary and promotion prospects of an honours graduate.³⁴ Indeed some respondents claimed that that was seen as its primary function by their colleagues. However, although a small number of respondents admitted that they had hoped to improve on their first degree (23 - some 4.5%)³⁵ the majority *were* already honours graduates (56.5%) - Table 7 - and among those graduating in the 1920s and 30s the proportion was considerably higher (67.4%) at a time when graduating with honours was still far from the norm in Scottish

Table 7

Nature of first degree.
(percentage in brackets)

	Ordinary Graduates	Honours Graduates	Arts Graduates	Science Graduates (including geography)
Aberdeen	31(39.2)	48(60.8)	60(75.9)	18(22.8)
Edinburgh pre-1950	18(34.0)	35(66.0)	40(76.9)	12(23.1)
" post-1950	33(47.8)	36(52.2)	59(85.5)	10(14.5)
" total	51(41.8)	71(58.2)	99(81.1)	22(18.0)
Glasgow pre-1950	46(44.2)	58(55.8)	78(75.0)	26(25.0)
" post-1950	52(46.4)	60(53.6)	90(80.4)	22(19.6)
" full-time	16(44.4)	20(55.6)	27(75.0)	9(25.0)
" part-time	82(45.6)	98(54.4)	141(78.3)	39(21.7)
" total	98(45.4)	118(54.6)	168(77.8)	48(22.2)
St Andrews	21(40.4)	31(59.6)	41(82.0)	9(18.0)
Belfast	20(47.6)	22(52.4)	31(73.8)	11(26.2)
Part-time	105(43.9)	134(56.1)	179(75.2)	59(24.8)
Full-time	113(42.0)	156(58.0)	220(81.8)	49(18.2)
Male	127(36.1)	225(63.9)	262(75.1)	87(24.9)
Female	75(61.0)	48(39.0)	111(90.2)	12(9.8)
1920s & 30s	28(32.6)	58(67.4)	63(73.3)	23(26.7)
1940s	49(46.2)	57(53.8)	83(79.0)	22(21.0)
1950s	96(48.5)	102(51.5)	156(80.0)	39(20.0)
1960s	47(39.5)	72(60.5)	95(80.5)	23(19.5)
Overall	221(43.2)	290(56.8)	399(78.7)	108(21.3)

universities. As Tables 3a and 3b show, in 1929-30 less than one fifth of Glasgow Arts degrees and less than one third of Edinburgh Arts degrees were awarded with honours and even by 1939-40, though the proportion had increased in Glasgow to just under a third, in Edinburgh it had dropped back to a quarter. By 1960, Honours graduates still formed less than 40% of Arts graduates in both universities. Given the relative ease of entry to university courses at the time - at least in terms of standards, if not of finance - this suggests that the Bachelor of Education groups may well have been above average in academic quality.

This high standard of recruit seems to have been particularly characteristic of Edinburgh where 66% were honours graduates, partly accounted for perhaps by the attraction from outwith Scotland - and Britain - of other countries' promising candidates. Even so, it must be noted that despite the increase in the number of honours degrees being awarded by the universities, the proportion of honours graduates attempting the Edinburgh BEd dropped considerably after 1950 to 52.2%. Moreover, despite the tendency of some Edinburgh BQ respondents of the Thomson period to pour scorn on the Glasgow part-timers, they included a respectable 54.4% who *were* honours graduates - higher than the national figure for the degrees' boom period in the 1940s and 50s. Even so, it is of course true that the actual number of Glasgow EdBs with an ordinary first degree entering the labour market was greater than in the case of Edinburgh.

The most striking figure, however, is the low proportion of honours graduates among women respondents, only 39% in contrast to the men's 63.9%. This does reflect the position in the Arts faculties and a proper explanation of this would involve an as yet unattempted investigation of Scottish female attitudes to honours graduation over the fifty years as well as of the inadequate development by the universities of so much of the national talent. It must, however, as it stands, provide evidence to counter the view that large numbers of already academically distinguished women took the degree out of frustration with the career structure in the schools.

BQ responses suggest that this was sometimes true, but such a motivation could only have been present in a small minority of cases.

So far as the Arts:Science ratio is concerned, the high proportion of females with an Arts background is less surprising, given the situation in the university as a whole, than their failure to participate more fully in the professional degree of a profession with a female majority. What is most striking perhaps is the increase in the proportion of Arts graduates over the whole period³⁶ – especially in Edinburgh – despite the increasingly scientific orientation of the psychological and statistical work involved, though Semeonoff has drawn attention to the fact that, in Scotland, the degree “was the normal method of entry into psychology, at least for a man with an Arts background”.³⁷

3. Graduates' reasons for taking the course

There must, of course, be considerable doubt about the findings of BQ on this issue. Some people never fully formulate their reasons for doing a particular academic course. They may simply follow their peers or drift into the first available option that presents itself in order to avoid decisions; and even where a conscious decision is based on careful reasoning, it is doubtful if the true motives can be fully discerned or recollected after a period of many years or even decades. At the same time, what are clearly recollected but “shameful” motives may well be concealed, even in an anonymous questionnaire.

However, BQ assumed that such failures of memory and insight, as well as positive deceptions, would not totally invalidate this section of the questionnaire, particularly as it was assumed that a number of motives could exist alongside each other. Thus in each individual case the respondent was invited, if necessary, to cite an array and not merely one major reason for undertaking the course and an instrumental career-orientated reason might therefore be cited alongside one inspired by purely intellectual curiosity. The various reasons given for embarking on the course are

summarised in Table 8, which reveals that the five most significant, in rank order, appear to have been:

	cited by
1. A desire to understand more fully the theoretical bases of education	51.9%
2. A desire for improved status as a school teacher	40%
3. A desire to become a qualified psychologist	35.3%
4. A desire to become an educational administrator	27.1%
5. A response to the influence and encouragement of a university teacher	26.5%

This rank order shows a remarkable correspondence to that found by Rudd and Simpson in their sample of post-graduate students and the supremacy of general over instrumental echoes the findings of Baker and Sikora in a recent survey of English teachers' reasons for involvement in in-service training courses.³⁸

Apart from demonstrating the mixture of motives involved, these figures show a remarkable loyalty to the original view of the degree's purposes as outlined by Darroch and Drever: (a) that it was intended to provide a general study of educational issues, rather than being merely a form of specialist or research training, and (b) that teachers, as the central educational profession, were the group for which it was mainly intended. According to Fleming, Boyd was in the early days astonished to discover that she would rather work in Jordanhill than return to teaching. He had never imagined that the degree would be a road to a new career.³⁹

As table 8 makes clear, however, the overall rank order does not hold good for every BQ grouping. The orientation to actual school-teaching seems to have been consistently lower in Edinburgh than in the other universities and the attractions of research greater in Edinburgh and St. Andrews than elsewhere though in the latter case, the fact that all graduations took place after the second war, when research was

Table 8

Reasons for embarking on the course: numbers citing suggested reasons
(percentage in brackets)

	A desire to understand more fully the theoretical bases of education	The influence & encouragement of a university teacher	The influence & encouragement of friends involved in the course or holding the degree	The desire to train for educational research	A desire to become a qualified psychologist	A desire to become a univ/colle teacher	A desire to become an educational administrator	A desire for improved status as a school teacher	Improving career prospects though not in teaching	Prolonging university life	As a way out of teaching
Total	266(51.9)	136(26.5)	80(15.6)	91(17.7)	181(35.3)	113(22.0)	139(27.1)	205(40.0)	10(1.9)	129(25.1)	44(8.6)
Belfast	20(46.5)	18(41.9)	5(11.6)	5(11.6)	27(62.8)	7(16.3)	3(7.0)	18(41.9)	1(2.3)	9(20.9)	6(14.0)
Aberdeen	35(44.3)	19(24.1)	9(11.4)	11(13.9)	28(35.4)	16(20.3)	23(29.1)	37(46.8)	2(2.5)	17(21.5)	6(7.6)
Edinburgh:											
pre-1950	23(43.4)	20(37.7)	12(22.6)	13(24.5)	12(22.6)	12(22.6)	17(32.1)	14(26.4)		19(35.9)	6(11.3)
post-1950	38(55.1)	22(31.9)	8(11.6)	19(27.5)	28(40.6)	24(34.8)	15(21.7)	20(29.0)		15(21.7)	7(10.1)
total	61(50.0)	42(34.4)	20(16.4)	32(26.2)	40(32.8)	36(29.5)	32(26.2)	34(27.9)		34(27.9)	13(10.7)
Glasgow:											
pre-1950	61(58.7)	24(23.1)	15(14.4)	17(16.3)	32(30.8)	21(20.2)	36(34.6)	45(43.3)	1(1.0)	28(26.9)	5(4.8)
post-1950	64(56.6)	24(21.2)	27(23.9)	10(8.9)	38(33.6)	19(16.8)	27(23.9)	52(46.0)	3(2.7)	28(24.8)	7(6.2)
part-time	108(59.7)	42(23.2)	40(22.1)	19(10.5)	58(37.0)	33(18.2)	52(28.7)	78(43.1)	4(2.2)	43(23.8)	11(6.1)
full-time	17(47.2)	6(16.7)	2(5.6)	8(22.2)	12(33.3)	7(19.4)	11(30.6)	19(52.8)		13(36.1)	1(2.8)
total	125(57.6)	48(22.1)	42(19.4)	27(12.4)	70(32.3)	40(18.4)	63(29.0)	97(44.7)	4(1.8)	56(25.8)	12(5.5)
St Andrews	25(48.1)	9(17.3)	4(7.7)	16(30.8)	16(30.8)	14(26.9)	18(34.6)	19(36.5)	3(5.8)	11(21.2)	8(15.4)
Part-time	141(59.9)	53(22.2)	50(20.9)	26(10.9)	74(31.0)	45(18.8)	70(29.3)	105(43.9)	6(2.5)	50(20.9)	16(6.7)
Full-time	125(45.6)	83(30.3)	30(11.0)	65(23.7)	107(39.1)	68(24.8)	69(25.2)	100(36.5)	4(1.5)	73(26.6)	28(10.2)
Male	185(52.6)	92(26.1)	49(13.9)	64(18.2)	102(29.0)	84(23.9)	120(34.1)	166(47.2)	5(1.4)	94(26.7)	29(8.2)
Female	61(49.6)	36(29.3)	25(20.3)	19(15.4)	62(50.4)	17(13.8)	9(7.3)	24(19.5)	5(4.1)	33(26.8)	13(10.6)
1930s	47(54.7)	29(33.7)	10(11.6)	16(18.6)	20(23.3)	23(26.7)	35(40.7)	39(45.3)		16(18.6)	7(8.1)
1940s	51(48.1)	27(25.5)	20(18.9)	18(17.0)	33(31.1)	18(17.0)	32(30.2)	39(36.8)	3(2.8)	23(21.7)	5(4.7)
1950s	103(51.8)	51(25.6)	36(18.1)	34(17.1)	76(38.2)	37(18.6)	57(28.6)	80(40.2)	3(1.5)	42(21.1)	15(7.5)
1960s	64(53.8)	27(22.7)	13(10.9)	22(18.5)	51(42.9)	34(28.6)	15(12.6)	45(37.8)	4(3.4)	26(21.8)	16(13.4)

placed on a better footing, makes this less surprising. Male candidates, possibly because they could more readily expect promotion than could females under Scottish conditions, seemed to place a greater emphasis on improving their status as teachers, while women seem to have wished to leave their low promotion prospects in teaching behind, given that 50.4% of them expressed an interest in becoming professional psychologists.

More striking is the extremely low proportion of women expressing any interest in an administrative career (7.3%) or even in college/university teaching (13.8%), compared with the male figures of 34.1% and 23.9% respectively, no doubt again reflecting a realistic assessment of the career structure in those fields. No doubt the public image of the child psychologist as a nurse figure favoured female entry to that new profession, just as entry to gynaecological medicine and paediatrics was no doubt favoured, once the general right of female entry to the medical profession had been won.

The score of around 50% for general educational study seems constant over all the groups and decades as does the desire to prolong university life (about 20%), though this latter motivation, sometimes mentioned by contemporary student journalists in their discussion of the diploma and degree,⁴⁰ did not figure prominently in the open-ended discussion encouraged by BQ and there seems little evidence that work at the Diploma stage was all that often undertaken merely to secure a place in a university team or to provide an opening to the other social positions more easily open to post-graduate students, though one BQ respondent who was currently President of the Edinburgh Students Representative Council claims that he had to demit office in his final year after a warning from the Professor of Psychology that he was not working hard enough.

More detailed analysis of this response suggests that the continued attractions of university were mainly intellectual, and only 17 (3.3%) favoured a return to university

because they had no job at the time.

Of the small number of respondents who admitted to having seen the course as a way out of school-teaching, 17 (3.3%) saw it not so much as a turning of their back on a distasteful occupation as an insurance policy, should their promotion or even their job stability in teaching fade and it seems likely that the majority of those who really did want to turn their back on teaching as such, saw their alternative as positively lying in psychology⁴¹ or in administration, though a handful eventually found their way out into business and industry where a knowledge of mental testing and occupational psychology was beginning to prove useful from a career point of view. One student, indeed, was destined to become President of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce.

Table 9 demonstrates the relationship to each other of some of the multiple responses to the question on motivation. Not surprisingly only 16.1% of those seeking improved status as teachers were also interested in training for research, though the figure for budding administrators (20.1%) is not much higher, a somewhat surprising fact given that in many people's view, the degree's purpose was to produce administrators capable of organising experimental activity within their authorities. Even more surprisingly, in view of more recent assumptions, only 21.5% of those wishing to be professional psychologists were interested in research training, suggesting that for most of the degree's history it was seen more as a technical training course for practitioners in clinics and testing services than as a general introduction to the world of modern experimental psychology, a feeling borne out by the more detailed reactions to the psychology component discussed below. Also interesting is the very low percentage (16.6) of those hoping to improve their status as teachers, who expressed an interest in university/college teaching, in view of the fact, discussed below, that this did in fact become a major destination for graduates.

Table 9

Those combining various responses on motivation for embarking on course.

A \ B	A desire to train for research	A desire to become a qualified psychologist	A desire to become a Univ/Coll lecturer	A desire to become an educational administrator	A desire for improved status as a school teacher
A desire to understand educational theory more fully	60 a 65.9 b 22.6	71 a 39.2 b 26.7	57 a 50.4 b 21.4	61 a 43.9 b 22.9	95 a 46.3 b 35.7
A desire to train for research		39 a 21.5 b 42.9	35 a 31.0 b 38.5	28 a 20.1 b 30.8	33 a 16.1 b 36.3
A desire to become a qualified psychologist			41 a 36.3 b 22.7	33 a 23.7 b 18.2	32 a 15.6 b 17.7
A desire to become a univ/coll lecturer				27 a 19.4 b 23.9	34 a 16.6 b 30.1
A desire to become an educational administrator					58 a 28.3 b 41.7

a. A as % of B

b. B as % of A

4. Full time/part time

At all the universities except Edinburgh it was possible, under the regulations, to do the degree course on either a full-time or a part-time basis, though even in Edinburgh, Thomson, never a stickler for rigid adherence to academic rules, allowed a few candidates to combine 'full-time' study with relevant full-time work outside.⁴² The incidence of part-time study ranged from 4.9% in Edinburgh to 75.7% in Glasgow. In Aberdeen it was 46.8% and in St. Andrews 25%. In this particular respect there seems little difference between the sex groupings (male 45.5%, female 48%).

91.8% of full-timers preferred it that way. Of the part-timers, 34.3% would have preferred full-time study but 58.6% were definitely against it, in some cases (but not in all) on financial grounds. One St. Andrews man had abandoned full-time after five months "in a state of physical exhaustion", yet most full-timers naturally assumed that it was part-time that involved the greater strain. A number of respondents feared the academic disadvantages produced by the distractions of a full day's teaching but others felt that on such a course, mixing theory and practice was a positive advantage. Moral issues of a kind common in Scotland also played a part. A Glasgow part-timer, for example, 'had the idea that he was under a moral obligation to earn his own living' after being grant-aided through his undergraduate course and many wished to end their dependence on their parents (in the days before universal grants). For some, indeed, the choice was made for them by aid-granting agencies such as employers or the Carnegie Trust, but perhaps the factor that is most easily forgotten in any consideration of why people opted for one mode or the other is the sheer weight of current assumptions. An Edinburgh 1937 student suggested that the idea of part-time study was "not in vogue at that time, even though we paid for the full-time course ourselves", while three Glasgow respondents of the same period claimed that they had "never even thought of doing it full-time", though these conflicting views of normality may reflect a socio-economic difference between Edinburgh and Glasgow students that was deliberately not explored by BQ for reasons explained in Appendix

A.

Most part-timers were primary and secondary teachers (300 in fact) though 23 were employed in tertiary institutions, including 8 university lecturers. Three were already working in local education offices and most remarkably of all, perhaps, in view of the demanding nature of later professional requirements, 7 were already employed as *unqualified* educational psychologists.

Most employers continued to regard part-time candidates as full-time employees and only 6% of respondents reported difficulties in getting time off to attend classes, although this may have been more difficult in the early days for candidates who had died by the time of BQ and even among respondents, 30.9% of part-timers reported that deductions had been made from their salaries in respect of time spent on the course, a common experience in all three part-time centres, though the Glasgow position seems to have improved somewhat after 1950.

Among full-timers, the financial strain of doing the course was described as 'very great' by 12.3% and 'moderate' by 49.4% even though 35.5% of full-timers were in receipt of no grant at all and this may have bear out Rusk's claim to BQ that really poor Scottish teachers chose to do the London External Diploma at home instead.⁴³

The situation would no doubt have been worse had not a remarkable 79.6% of graduates still been single by the time of the award, with a further 7.7% married without children. The overwhelming majority, therefore, despite an average age of 29.6, had limited domestic commitments, which was probably just as well in view of the pressures of such a short but demanding course.

One graduate felt that the degree's redesignation as MEd in the 1960s was particularly appropriate as it was for him *Mactator Elegentiae Domesticae*, a wrecker of domestic harmony. Among full-timers and part-timers alike, the overwhelming majority of females were unmarried (94.3%) - the figure for males was 61.9 - and

such figures recall Boyd's observation that teachers should regard themselves as a separate, dedicated social group, marrying each other when the time was ripe and putting their profession first.

5. The partnership of Education and Psychology

One of the chief characteristics of the course in all four centres was that it was a joint responsibility of the Education and Psychology departments. Whether this was meant to be an 'equal' partnership is now a matter of some dispute for Seth in demanding such equality in the Belfast degree, believed he was breaking new ground.⁴⁴ Even so it was for long accepted as an honours degree in both subjects and was in all cases, until the 1960s, given full professional recognition by the British Psychological Society. Indeed, for a long period, it was the only honours degree in Psychology available in the Scottish universities and Semeonoff has noted how, even after the establishment of an honours MA in the subject at Edinburgh, the BEd continued to be more popular with budding professionals, presumably because it could be earned more rapidly and was clearly linked to job opportunities.⁴⁵

It was therefore of considerable importance to the Psychology departments who only in later years began to view their BEd/EdB role as one of servicing someone else's degree. In the post-1945 period, as scientific psychology expanded, it might well have been thought to be too applied in its orientation to remain a central departmental concern. In the event, however, Psychology departments worked hard to keep it in their array of courses by pressing for greater specialisation possibilities to satisfy the increased demands of the British Psychology Society, which was of course, far more used to English-style specialised honours degrees.

The result was often a greater emphasis on the research report or thesis, which took on the form and significance of the dissertation in the English MEd, usually a far less generalist degree and one conceived on different principles.⁴⁶ Even so, there continued to be an insistence on wide-ranging course work and written papers in

both departments.

Any call for greater specialisation was very much a function of Psychology's growing complexity and academic confidence after a period when its general reputation with both academics and public had been as uncertain as that of Education itself.⁴⁷ Indeed, in the eyes of some, their close links had been mutually damaging. In the days before any other Psychology honours degree existed, the Scottish departments in that subject had been more than willing to reach compromises to keep the education degree alive and for almost 65% of the BQ respondents the question of a more specialised approach to Psychology had never arisen. For the 88.7% of pre-1950 Edinburgh students who had never considered it, this was largely explained by the lack of any clear syllabus boundaries between the two areas presided over by a Professor of Education (Thomson) who was really a psychologist or, as Lumsden prefers, "a biologist"⁴⁸ and by a Professor of Psychology (Drever) who was, by initial training and inclination, an accomplished educationist, but even in the days before Thomson, the examination papers for Edinburgh candidates show no clear distinction between experimental education and philosophical and administrative issues. The 1919 Paper, for example, examined by Drever and Rusk, includes not only questions on individual and group testing, as well as on Binet and the testing of "defective" children, but also asked students to "consider the claim of Experimental Education to rank as an independent science" and included a question on how to carry out a survey of a school system.⁴⁹ Ironically, in later years, some Edinburgh students felt that, with two psychologists running the degree, a number of important psychological topics were neglected through falling between two stools.

Indeed, given the present state of Psychology as a discipline, with its separate sectors and schools of thought, it is possible to forget the eclectic, less discriminating approach of pre-war courses and journals. The 1937 volume of *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, for example, contains, alongside a technical article by P.E. Vernon on the norms and validity of certain mental tests at a Child Guidance

Clinic, a highly subjective article by B. Edzell on "Dickens and Child Psychology" – speaking of the "marvellous portrait of the delicate, introspective child (provided) in Paul Dombey" – only to be followed in turn by an article by Burt on Factor Analysis "with and without Successive Approximation". A similar variety of level and reference groups characterised most other contemporary British journals in the educational and psychological fields and Macallister notes how Drever in Edinburgh and Watt in Glasgow both combined statistically based experimental psychology with an enthusiasm for Freud.⁵⁰

In the post-war years things were placed on a much more rigorous scientific footing and some of the new generation of Edinburgh Psychology staff, filled with a new professional confidence, began to make it clear to their Education students that the poor reputation of Educational Studies was for them a valid one. They made no secret of the fact that to them the Education section of the degree course was the softer and less demanding part and gave such students the impression, as one respondent put it, that Education degree students in the Psychology department 'were amateurs blundering around among professionals'. However, almost half the students (47.2%) found the two sections of the course equally difficult and in the pre-1950 period this rises to 50% in Glasgow and 67.9% in Edinburgh. Even so there were in all four places and at all times more who found Psychology difficult than Education, a fact explained in part, perhaps, by the previous training of students, 77% of whom had taken a first degree in Arts.

The most remarkable aspect of the Education/Psychology relationship in the inter-war years, however, was the small amount, or even total lack of interaction and social intercourse between the staffs of the two departments in both Edinburgh and Glasgow even when relations were good, and even in the pioneering days of Drever and Darroch. As Hearnshaw has shown, in relation to University College, London, this is not an unknown phenomenon among University Departments supposedly working as partners.⁵¹ It was certainly true after Thomson's arrival in Edinburgh, despite the

warmth of Hearnshaw's tribute to the importance of the Thomson/Drever partnership⁵² and Thouless, who was head of the Glasgow psychology department, claimed that Boyd (who, some believed, had had the degree and its form foisted upon him by Principal MacAllister) positively refused to make any attempt at integration. It was, Thouless claimed, only with the coming of Rusk in 1946 that there was any positive approach to the Psychology partner,⁵³ and this despite Boyd's career as a developer of clinics and testing. Even so, Thouless' claim seems only to have related to intra-course links for Boyd apparently invited both him and Vernon to participate in his Saturday morning meetings for teachers.⁵⁴

There was a considerable response to BQ's open-ended question on this subject and with very few exceptions (mostly from Aberdeen) respondents were critical of the links, some of them even questioning whether there could ever be a fruitful relationship between (to quote a St. Andrews student) 'two such uneasy bedfellows'. Many even spoke of overt antagonisms. They were, said one, 'at war with one another', united only 'in generally ignoring the findings of Sociology'. According to an Edinburgh graduate of the 60s there was actual pressure on students from Pilley, as Professor of Education, to avoid the use of psychological terms, such as 'determinant' or 'conditioning' in any of his tutorials, while Drever *fills* (though not all his staff) was said to be 'totally uninterested in his Education students', a judgement also made on Thouless by his Psychology colleague, Gardner.⁵⁵ Certainly the two Glasgow departments were, in the 1940s, openly in conflict over how testing should be used while even in the Thomson/Drever era in Edinburgh there was, it was generally agreed, exceptionally little contact between them with the two 'following their own ways. No clash but no contact. There was in practice no relationship', a situation caused in part by the fact that one was housed in Moray House and the other in the University proper.

Such a separation and its consequences were to excite public criticism. The 1946 Advisory Council Report on Teacher Training, for example, protested that the two

subjects were always taught too separately and suggested the development of more general courses in Educational Science, 'a science which has a field of its own but also draws freely upon the principles of many others'.⁵⁶ The Report saw in such a proposal an opportunity to introduce into the Scottish education curriculum, as Laurie and Meiklejohn had suggested seventy years earlier, the hitherto neglected Sociology (a plea backed by 10% of BQ respondents) and to expand the comparative study of education systems.

More vividly Seth, Professor of Psychology in Belfast, described the BEd/EdB as an "unrecognised conversion course" for budding psychologists, "which in the memory becomes a remarkable goulash of psychophysics, rewards and punishments ... Miss Beauchamp's dissociated personalities, marinated K hler ... tetrad differences and correlational techniques, instincts in man, the unequal struggle with space perception according to Stout and the barely audible tortuosities of John Dewey's 'Quest for Certainty'".⁵⁷

The degree suffered, however, from more than inter-departmental strains. There seems also to have been considerable internal strife within the Psychology departments themselves over the syllabus to be offered to Education students, reflecting often the current tensions within the psychological profession generally. Students complained, for example, that what were regarded as the purer forms of psychology, such as perception and learning theory, were often emphasised at the expense of other forms of psychology such as the work of Piaget that were not yet acceptable to an American professional hierarchy which tended to dictate fashions of respectability in the post-war period. While some Psychology lecturers were enthusiastic about their work with Education students, others seemed to feel that any overt concentration on Education-related Psychology might well carry a stigma within the subjects's developing career structure, and some Edinburgh lecturers in Psychology at this same period even felt it a stigma to be in the Faculty of Social Sciences, rather than in the Faculty of Science itself.

In the face of such developments, often produced by a genuine belief in the poor scientific quality of much that had passed for Educational Psychology in the past, some Scottish University Education Departments had, according to respondents, to take over part of the Psychology teaching themselves, thus giving students what they felt was second best, echoing a dissatisfaction with the psychology teaching that had been felt by students even in the earliest days.

A Glasgow student of the late 20s, for example, felt that any adequate discussion of "real" educational psychology, as opposed to psychoanalysis and aesthetics, had been totally lacking, while even a Thomson/Drever student of 1945 claimed that, had he not later taken a London Diploma in the subject (a Diploma considered by Burt to be inferior to the BEd and not recognised in the same way by the BPS⁵⁸) his knowledge of Educational Psychology would have been severely limited.

Overall the responses leave an impression of considerable dissatisfaction with the place and provision of Psychology in such an Education degree. One aspect of the Psychology teaching that certainly helped to validate the status of the BEd/EdB as a genuine Honours Psychology degree, however, was the large number of Psychology classes that respondents actually shared with undergraduate students seeking the MA or BSc. This was especially so in post-1950 Edinburgh where as many as 39% of students recalled that *all* their Psychology lectures and practical classes were shared with undergraduates, though there were from time to time complaints that this not only led to a neglect of educational issues but also to overcrowding of laboratories.⁵⁹

6. General reactions to the course

The difficulties over psychology were partly the result of a genuine attempt by that department's staff to give the wider grounding in the subject increasingly insisted upon by the British Psychological Society as a condition of professional recognition, even though much of the extra material seemed irrelevant to the daily work of the teacher or even of the educational psychologist. It is also true that many of the BQ

criticisms of the psychology teaching were also being made in the light of later developments and experiences that could hardly have been envisaged years or decades earlier by those running a course of limited duration with limited resources. They were in fact being judged by latter-day Psychologists who now were ashamed of the general naivety of their discipline twenty or more years earlier.

It is therefore salutary to return to table 10 and the overall finding that 94.2% of respondents found the BEd/EdB course generally 'worthwhile', in its own right and that only 3 out of 513 would go so far as to describe it as 'not worthwhile' with the satisfaction rating in no Scottish group falling below 92.1%. It is in this perspective, therefore, that respondents' detailed comments on the course content must be examined.

To some extent the reactions recorded by BQ to individual subject areas simply reflect the interests and enthusiasms of a student body consisting largely of Arts graduates but they by no means square with some commonly held views at the time of the survey on what subjects were likely to appeal to Education students. Towards the end of the 1960s, for example, Moray House College pressed for the removal of much of the Philosophy from the Edinburgh diploma course as "irrelevant" though Scotland, Principal of the Aberdeen College appeared to make a curious distinction between subjects that are 'useful' to the teacher and those that are 'relevant'.⁶⁰ Yet 26.4% of the BQ respondents who had taken the degree *since* 1950 felt that the Philosophy and Theory of Education had awoken their 'special enthusiasm', including 27.7% of those who had taken it since 1960, while only 1.4% (7 out of 513) called for the disappearance of the subject.

In fact, Philosophy's popularity continually increased in both Glasgow and Edinburgh, being cited by 39.6% of students during what was mainly the Pilley period, while only 4.4% believed the subject had been given undue emphasis. It is more difficult to assess the overall popularity of Psychology, as responses to an

Table 10

General feelings about the course as an
educational experience in its own right.
(percentages in brackets)

	Course was worthwhile in its own right	Course was not worthwhile in its own right	Mixed feelings on the subject	No information	Total
Total	483(94.2)	3(0.6)	26(5.1)	1(0.2)	513
Belfast	38(88.4)	1(2.3)	4(9.3)		43
Aberdeen	77(97.5)		2(2.5)		79
Edinburgh:					
pre-1950	51(96.3)		2(3.8)		53
post-1950	65(94.2)		3(4.4)	1(1.5)	69
total	116(95.1)		5(4.1)	1(0.8)	
Glasgow:					
pre-1950	98(94.2)		6(5.8)		104
post-1950	104(92.1)	2(1.8)	7(6.2)		113
part time	169(93.3)	2(1.2)	10(5.6)		181
full time	33(94.2)		3(5.8)		36
total	202(93.0)	2(1.0)	13(6.0)		217
St Andrews	77(96.2)		2(3.8)		79
Part time	224(93.8)	2(0.8)	12(5.0)	1(0.4)	239
Full time	259(94.5)	1(0.4)	14(5.1)		274
1930s	81(94.2)		4(4.7)	1(1.2)	86
1940s	102(96.2)		4(3.8)		106
1950s	183(92.0)	3(1.5)	13(6.5)		199
1960s	114(95.8)		5(4.2)		119

open-ended question tended to give a fragmented picture, some respondents being more specific than others. Some, for example, simply named Piaget while others spoke more generally of "educational" psychology. Even so, it is interesting to note the degree of enthusiasm for the forms of scientific psychology most apparently remote from the needs of classroom, the clinic or the education office, such as perception studies (13.2% in post-1950 Edinburgh).

Given the Arts background of most students it is not surprising to find that Psychology generally (46%) and Experimental Education (34.1%) proved the most difficult subject areas with 20.8% in addition finding Psychology not so much difficult as "uncongenial". 18.5% also found it was given undue emphasis, though only 8.4% felt it could have been dispensed with altogether.

This latter was in fact the highest disapproval score for any element in the course, a fact that suggests the vast majority of students were happy with the degree's generalist nature and were not prepared to endorse the wide-ranging move towards specialisation that the new MEd degree eventually initiated.

Respondents were also asked to comment on omissions from the course as they had known it and many of the subjects missed by older respondents had of course been subsequently introduced during later periods of its history. One exception was Sociology, demanded by 10.7% of respondents though it has to be borne in mind, that the desirability of its inclusion in British teacher-training courses was still an open question even as late as the 1960s. Few British universities had a chair in the subject when that decade opened and as late as 1967, S. Nisbet continued to suggest that he still saw the old Education/Psychology partnership as a suitable basis for the degree.⁶¹

Ironically, during the whole of BQ, no-one from Glasgow mentioned the subjects of Hygiene and Physiology. Yet arguments and debate about the arrangement and nature of these classes had played a major role in the meetings of the Glasgow Board of Studies over a period of some forty years, an interesting comment on the way

academics allocate their time.

7. Research and research training

There was one aspect of the course, however, over which there was a far from generally enthusiastic response. Despite the fact that it was originally established in order to bring the Scottish profession into the mainstream of German/American, research-led educational thinking, there were considerable misgivings about the BEd/EdB's ability to equip students with an adequate research training. As table 11 shows, only 41.3% of respondents felt that it did so, while 24% positively felt it was not a good preparation and 31.6% had mixed feelings. Among the various groupings, only those from pre-1950 Edinburgh registered signs of reasonable approval but even they were far from unanimous, not an expected result, given the uncritical admiration of Thomson as a trainer of researchers recorded by some of his more successful students though it has to be noted that expressions of dissatisfaction with research training are not uncommon among post-graduate students generally. Rudd and Simpson in the 1970s, for example, found only 65% of Social Science post-graduate researchers in their sample claiming satisfaction, despite the general improvement of facilities for such research in the post-war period, particularly after Robbins. Moreover, satisfaction was markedly less in the Social Sciences than in Arts (76%) and Natural Sciences (78%).⁶² Their findings also suggest that Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews Universities were in general, by 1971, still far from geared to research needs, being in the lowest category of British universities so far as the proportion of post-graduate research students to the whole student body was concerned.⁶³

Bairstow, an early Assistant lecturer on the Aberdeen course, surprisingly claimed that no research exercise at all was demanded there in her time (the 1920s) and that this simply carried on an "Edinburgh tradition" well-known to her, just as Walker of Aberdeen claimed never to have done a thesis for his EdB in Glasgow. He had, he said, merely handed a short manuscript report on an experiment to Watt, the

Table 11

Judgements on course as
preparation for research.
(percentages in brackets)

	A good preparation	Not a good preparation	Mixed Feelings
Overall	212 (41.3)	123 (24.0)	162 (31.6)
Aberdeen	27 (34.2)	16 (20.3)	34 (43.0)
Belfast	17 (39.5)	11 (25.6)	15 (34.9)
Pre-1950 Edinburgh	39 (73.6)	7 (13.2)	5 (9.4)
Post-1950 Edinburgh	39 (56.5)	10 (14.5)	16 (23.2)
Edinburgh	78 (63.9)	17 (13.9)	21 (17.2)
Pre-1950 Glasgow	43 (41.3)	28 (26.9)	31 (29.8)
Post-1950 Glasgow	29 (25.7)	37 (32.7)	42 (37.2)
Glasgow	72 (33.2)	65 (30)	73 (33.6)
St Andrews	18 (34.6)	14 (26.9)	19 (36.5)
20s & 30s	43 (50.0)	20 (23.3)	17 (19.8)
40s	52 (49.0)	26 (24.5)	27 (25.5)
50s	74 (37.2)	44 (22.1)	74 (37.2)
60s	41 (34.5)	32 (26.9)	44 (37.0)

Psychology Lecturer.⁶⁴ while a Darroch student agreed that so far as research in the early twenties was concerned, 'no attention was given to the problem'. A Thomson/Drever student of the 1930s admitted to BQ that he was 'not really competent to say anything about (research) - not having done any!' while even the expert statistical training assumed to have been provided by Thomson could prove unsatisfactory, or certainly unbalanced, one student actually deplored the time spent on Thomson's favourite subject of factor analysis at the expense of other techniques.

Such adverse judgements as there are may, of course, simply result from present day academics and other researchers passing judgement on the methods that were generally current in their youth. Nor are the Scottish universities alone in facing such criticism. Rugg, as we noted earlier, claims that in order to prove they were genuine scientists, thousands of American researchers, and, in particular, candidates for higher degrees, 'counted, tabulated and measured' without having 'the slightest notion of the laws that underlay their procedures and their findings ... the tabulation of numbers in frequency distributions, the computation of averages and measures of dispersion took the place of the theory of numbers and the profound scientific concept of relationship and law. Not one in fifty was a master of the processes of logic or the concepts of philosophy and the basic sciences'.⁶⁵

Hopefully the Scottish graduates, given the nature of their course, were never in quite such a parlous state, for Rugg's criticism of an American confusion of artefacts with reality was endorsed by Thomson himself⁶⁶ although the response of one Edinburgh graduate, who dismissed the whole BQ exercise on the grounds that certain questions would require *an expression of opinion* - 'surely something of doubtful validity and difficult to verify' - suggests that some of the characteristics of Thorndike's more unthinking disciples were also to be found among Scottish graduates.

In fact, it is doubtful whether some of the course's teachers ever intended to

produce scientific researchers in the full sense. For Thouless, for example, the purpose of the course was never to provide a training ground for experts but merely to enable teachers to get some insight into what research involves,⁶⁷ an idea he obviously shared with Boyd who was astonished by the research demands made in the assessment of post-war EdB students.⁶⁸ In any case, he himself was never in many people's opinion a successful trainer of scientists despite his enthusiastic work for the EIS research committee. Certainly, Fleming told BQ, "he was good at starting hares"⁶⁹ but according to Gardner, later a lecturer in psychology, 'Boyd inspired you, but there was little to go on once you'd been inspired'. There were, he said, sporadic attempts at the supervision of theses 'but usually just a few hints were thrown out by supervisors'⁷⁰ and Boyd himself was quite willing to admit the limitations of his own research training.⁷¹ Lumsden, the Inspector most influential in developing educational psychology among the English LEAs, recalled that in the Edinburgh course of Thomson's time, there was never even any real emphasis on the technicalities and theory of test construction and little intervention by Thomson himself in the supervision of theses, most of which he left to his test construction team, though Lumsden admitted that he had acquired from Thomson a respect for evidence, as well as the gift of American links and forms of patronage in pursuing his later research. Moreover, he had, in a way novel for the time, been allowed to do a joint thesis with his wife.⁷²

It is not surprising therefore to find that some of those who taught for the degree shared students' later worries about the standard of training provided, even if Boyd was, it is true, to compare his Glasgow students' work favourably with what he encountered in Columbia.⁷³

Part of the problem seems to lie in the uncertainty of the research exercise's role in the structure of the degree, which was never clearly thought out in the early stages of its history. It was, after all, unknown in the equivalent professional degrees in law and divinity that the Bachelor of Education was supposed to emulate, while the

post-1945 emphasis on its importance as well as the increase in its scale from then onwards seemed to owe more to inappropriate modelling on quite differently conceived English specialist degrees than to a positive decision to alter the Scottish degree's nature. Certainly approval of the training provided falls off dramatically from then onwards. Given that the written paper examination retained its scale and importance it must indeed have been difficult to accommodate a thesis now being written on a scale that, elsewhere, might well have earned a degree by itself and in face of this, Aberdeen seems to have deliberately played down the importance of the thesis, seeing it once more as a mere research exercise rather than as a definitive body of research capable of earning a degree on its own. Some of the pre-1950 Edinburgh students, some of whom who now claim to have received a good training, were likely to be simply producing and/or standardising a Moray House test according to a formula, in exactly the way that Rugg condemned in America. Not until after the war did more than a handful of Edinburgh students produce anything that relied heavily on the collection of outside data, on wide and self-determined reading and on personal initiative. Though reports of some BEd/EdB work began to appear in journals as early as the 1930s and major research projects by graduates had become nationally known even earlier – that of C.M. Fleming of Glasgow, for example, whose Kelvin Measurement of Mental Ability had involved work with 2,000 pupils in 38 urban and rural schools⁷⁴ – the *general* body of pre-1950 research, produced as part of the course, was unimpressive by later standards, even if individual items such as Rodger (1936) are notable exceptions.

As against that, however, it must be said that if the situation in Scotland was bad, so far as research training was concerned, it was very much better than in England. As one Edinburgh graduate from as late as the 1960s, a product of Pilley's ostensibly anti-statistical department, put it: 'On coming to Manchester I had a much sounder grounding than any except other Edinburgh BEds. Multivariate research was virtually unknown here but no other grounding was possible' and although 'unknown' clearly

involves some exaggeration, Thomson emphasised the higher demands made of the Education students in Scotland, compared with their English counterparts.⁷⁵ Whatever the level of achievement reached during the course itself, therefore, there can be little doubt that Scottish graduates, over the fifty years, played a major role in the development of British and not merely Scottish educational research, particularly in the psychological field. Even the production rate of, admittedly, often imperfect theses marked something of an achievement and Osborne was to claim, as late as 1966, that the number of BEd/EdB theses extant still exceeded the total of such academic products in the whole of England,⁷⁶ while in Scotland itself, holders of the degree always figured prominently on the staff and committees of SCRE⁷⁷ as well as on influential local bodies such as the Fife and East Lothian research groups, which were noted and much praised in England.⁷⁸

Walker, director of SCRE, addressing a UNESCO conference at Hamburg in 1967, noted the process whereby McClelland's celebrated investigation of secondary school allocation methods had first made an impact on Scottish secondary schools. The Assistant Director in one county, being an Edinburgh BEd, had 'adapted and applied techniques (mentioned in the survey) to a group of pupils transferring to secondary schools in 1944 (and) on the basis of his experiment, the Advisory Council incorporated his ideas into its Primary Education report of 1946, suggesting their adoption elsewhere'.⁷⁹ Thus it was sometimes at levels lower than the very top of the administration that the degree could have a considerable effect. Not surprisingly, therefore, Walker indicated to his Hamburg audience that Scottish training was provided not in research units but rather in the University Departments of Education and indeed SCRE had in 1949-54 issued a series of booklets, containing general bibliographies and aids to research planning, specifically for the use of students in those departments.⁸⁰

Walker therefore looked forward to the newly created Godfrey Thomson Unit for Educational Research in the Edinburgh department (financed by the Thomson Research

Fund) as a vehicle for carrying on that tradition, the best evidence of the strength of which is to be found in a survey of all post-graduate theses for the years 1918-44 in the Psychology and teaching methods fields that was published by the *British Journal of Educational Psychology* in 1944.⁸¹ Of those listed no less than 164 were the work of Scottish BEd/EdBs (85 from Edinburgh, 78 from Glasgow and 1 from Aberdeen) compared with figures such as 42 from Manchester (a university with many Scottish graduates on its staff and much influenced by Scottish degree forms), 45 from Leeds, 34 from Birmingham, 14 from Wales and 11 from Bristol. Only the London MA (with 121) was operating on a larger scale than the two large Scottish universities, with much of the English and Welsh work being more philosophically and historically based than its Scottish counterpart, while a great deal of the Edinburgh and Glasgow work dated from the pre-1950 period when the incidence of such work in most universities south of the Border had been negligible.

In the years immediately following that report there can be no doubt that research standards in Glasgow were considerably improved by the arrival of Rusk as Lecturer in Education. He had been Director of SCRE since its inception and brought vigour and example to the Glasgow teaching which was to have a later indirect influence on the research policies of SED through Rusk's student, Morris, who, as an HMI and the Department's chief adviser on the research,⁸² did much to galvanise the University Departments into greater non-student-related research activity in the 60s and 70s, using the Burn Conferences as one means of evangelism.

Despite its imperfections, therefore, Scottish research training standards must have been at least comparatively successful by contemporary standards. Wall notes the isolated nature of the English NFER, "apart from one or two university departments with skeleton research programmes", in the first decade of its existence⁸³ and significantly, Tibble, commenting in 1968 on the unsatisfactory nature of English post-graduate work in Education attributed it 'mainly (to) the non-existence of education as a first degree subject, thus denying the basis for higher studies',⁸⁴ a

difficulty that had been equally clear to Darroch and his contemporaries when they chose to make their professional degree *not* a post-graduate *research-based* degree on the current American model, being gradually adopted at the time (first in Wales and then in England⁸⁵) but as a '*first*' degree in the subject, albeit undertaken only by those who were already graduates in other subjects. To that extent therefore Anglo-Scottish comparisons become invidious until the post-1950 period, when moves to emphasise the thesis and to introduce specialisms, brought the Scottish and English post-graduate degrees closer together; though it has to be noted that this movement was taking place, ironically, at a time when Scottish first degrees themselves were beginning to incorporate a greater degree of specialisation and to include a minor research dissertation even at the undergraduate level.

In the pre-war period, even in departments where Philosophy and History were strong, the BEd/EdB research exercise seems often to have been mainly seen as a teaching device. According to Inglis, speaking to BQ of Glasgow before 1939, the thesis was seen as "a make-weight" rather than as part of the examination and was meant to deal purely with remedial and other school-orientated issues. In other words it was a way of teaching Experimental Education, Statistics and Psychology while theses on Historical and Theoretical topics did not begin to appear in large numbers before the 1950s. Table 12 illustrates this concentration and the beginnings of a change after 1950⁸⁶ though J. Nisbet dates the major change a decade later when Psychology began to find rivals in Curriculum Studies, Sociology and Technology. "As a result", he claims, "research is more interesting and more relevant today".⁸⁷

One measure of the seriousness of BEd/EdB research is the extent to which it entered the public domain and, as table 13 shows, by the time of BQ 65.3% of all BEd/EdB theses had neither been published nor had led to further research activity in the same field. In no grouping, even of pre-1950 Edinburgh, does the figure fall below 50%. This is especially significant, of course, in the case of pre-1960 respondents, who had had a longer time in which to pursue these matters than more recent

Table 12

Subject of B.Ed/Ed.B thesis.
(percentage in brackets)

	Test Construction/ Statistics	Center Psychology	Surveys and Curriculum Study	Sociology	History of Education	Comparative Education	Philosophy
1920s & 30s	53 (61.6)	8 (0.9)	13 (15.1)	0	2 (2.3)	5 (5.8)	0
1940s	57 (53.8)	17 (16.0)	20 (18.9)	5 (4.7)	1 (0.9)	4 (3.8)	1 (0.9)
1950s	92 (46.2)	37 (18.6)	36 (18.1)	17 (8.5)	10 (5.0)	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)
1960s	38 (32.0)	22 (18.5)	23 (19.3)	9 (7.6)	23 (19.3)	3 (2.5)	1 (0.8)
Over-all	240 (46.8)	84 (16.4)	92 (17.9)	31 (6.0)	36 (7.0)	15 (2.9)	4 (0.8)

Table 13

The B.Ed/Ed.B. Thesis: publication and later research.
(percentages in brackets)

	All or some of thesis published	None of thesis published	Definitely later research in the same field	Definitely no further research in same field	None of thesis published and no further research in same field
Belfast	5(11.6)	35	8(18.6)	33(76.7)	30(69.8)
Aberdeen	13(16.5)	65(82.3)	8(10.1)	70(88.6)	60(75.9)
Edinburgh pre-1950	12(22.6)	39(73.6)	14(26.4)	37(69.8)	30(56.6)
" post-1950	16(23.2)	51(73.9)	19(27.5)	46(66.7)	38(55.0)
" total	28(23.0)	90(73.8)	33(27.0)	83(68.0)	68(55.7)
Glasgow pre-1950	36(34.6)	67(64.4)	23(22.1)	80(76.9)	60(57.7)
" post-1950	18(15.9)	93(82.3)	22(19.5)	90(79.6)	79(70.0)
" total	54(24.9)	160(73.7)	45(20.7)	170(78.3)	139(64.0)
St Andrews	9(17.3)	42(80.8)	9(17.3)	42(80.8)	38(73.1)
1920s & 30s	20(23.3)	60(69.8)	23(26.7)	57(66.3)	51(59.3)
1940s	32(30.2)	73(68.9)	21(19.8)	84(79.2)	61(57.5)
1950s	35(17.6)	162(81.4)	34(17.1)	163(81.9)	143(71.9)
1960s	22(18.5)	97(81.5)	25(21.0)	94(78.9)	80(67.2)
Overall	109(21.2)	392(76.4)	103(20.1)	398(77.6)	335(65.3)

graduates.

Even so, all or part of many theses did receive publication, 20 of them in the 20s and 30s when the outlets for such work, particularly in Scotland, were severely limited. This makes it especially significant that a higher proportion of the earlier work (30.2% in the 1940s) was published than in later decades. It is also significant that early Glasgow produced more publications than early Edinburgh. Despite the predominance of test construction and experimental education among thesis topics the later work on history and curriculum appears more strongly in the lists of published work than might have been expected, given their comparative rarity, and SCRE in particular, possibly under Rusk's influence, for long encouraged work in such fields, as its series of county histories and reference works demonstrate.

One further indicator of the stimulus to research provided by the course is the scale on which its graduates completed other, more research-based higher degrees. As table 14 indicates, only some 9.7% went on to complete doctorates. However, the figure rises in Edinburgh to the remarkable total of 22.1% while for pre-1950 graduates it even reaches 28.3%, the most impressive single indicator of Thomson and Drever's success in academic terms. The figures are particularly remarkable given the widespread scepticism about the PhD that was to be found in British academic circles before 1950 even among those who believed in research⁸⁸ though Simpson notes the significant commitment of Edinburgh to the degree as early as the 1920s. Between 1921 and 1930, it awarded 280 compared with Glasgow's 105, St. Andrews' 73 and Aberdeen's 29. This may, however, reflect Edinburgh's commitment to overseas students, for whom the British "short" PhD was initially designed, rather than any academic superiority or commitment to research as such.⁸⁹

The proportion of doctorates falls steadily by decade, though this may be not so much a function of declining BEd/EdB standards (the natural view of some older respondents) as simply the result of the greater competitiveness and higher standards

Table 14

Later degrees.
(percentage in brackets)

	Doctorate	Post-graduate Master's Degree	No further degree	Ph.D in progress
Belfast	0	5(11.6)	37(86.0)	0
Aberdeen	3(3.8)	2(2.5)	71(89.9)	3(3.8)
Edinburgh:				
pre-1950	15(28.3)	1(1.9)	37(69.8)	0
post-1950	12(17.4)	1(1.4)	54(78.3)	1(1.4)
total	27(22.1)	2(1.6)	91(74.6)	1(0.8)
Glasgow:				
pre-1950	13(12.5)	1(1.0)	89(85.6)	1(1.0)
post-1950	6(5.3)	2(1.8)	101(89.4)	4(3.5)
total	19(8.8)	3(1.4)	190(87.6)	5(2.3)
St Andrews	1(1.9)	0	48(92.3)	2(3.8)
Male	37(10.5)	10(2.8)	296(84.0)	8(2.3)
Female	10(8.1)	0	111(90.2)	2(1.6)
1920s & 30s	17(19.8)	2(2.3)	66(76.7)	1(1.2)
1940s	15(14.2)	1(0.9)	90(84.9)	0
1950s	14(7.0)	8(4.0)	171(85.9)	4(2.0)
1960s	3(2.5)	1(0.8)	108(90.8)	6(5.0)
Ordinary first degree	17(7.7)	8(3.6)	195(87.8)	-
Honours first degree	33(11.4)	4(1.4)	242(83.4)	-
Overall	50(9.7)	12(2.3)	437(85.2)	11(2.1)

that became typical of the British PhD as it began to establish itself.⁹⁰ In addition, of course, the younger graduates of the 50s and 60s were less likely to have reached PhD stage by the time of BQ, especially if they were studying on a part-time basis.

It is perhaps a comment on the BEd/EdB degree's high status, at least in Scotland, that a mere handful of respondents had bothered to earn other degrees at less than doctorate level.

Table 14 also throws an interesting light on the common belief, discussed earlier, that the degree was often taken to allow Ordinary graduates to scrape into the Honours category, for no less than 17 respondents holding Ordinary first degrees eventually proceeded to the PhD, while the majority of those obtaining other research degrees had also been Ordinary graduates.

So far as later research work was concerned, further BQ findings suggest that some third of respondents had gone on to publish other research findings and/or text-books of some kind while less than half admitted to having done no further research or to having published nothing further in the field of Education or Psychology. This in itself provides some evidence of the contribution made by graduates to public educational debate if not to educational progress and it is particularly interesting to note the incidence of subsequent publication by Glasgow students of the pre-1950 period (45%) compared with that of Edinburgh students of the same period (26%), reflecting perhaps Boyd's own participation in and encouragement of educational journalism. At the same time it would be wrong to think that Thomson was not also interested in fostering such activities. In an introduction to Kennedy (1936), written at a very simple level with no overt reference to research, he said it was always "a great pleasure to introduce to the outside world a book written by one of my younger colleagues and I am glad to say that it is a pleasure that comes my way with welcome frequency".

In the end, it is always difficult to choose between Boyd and Thomson as patrons

of their own students and their influence dominated the whole development of the degree as a qualification for employment, the subject to which we now turn.

NOTES

1. Hearnshaw (1964) p 179.
2. *Scottish Educational Journal* 12 Mar 1965.
3. *College Courant* Vol XV No 29. He also paid tribute similarly to Thomson's BEd students, Thomson (1969) pp 117 ff.
4. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol 25 Jun 1955 Pt 2.
5. *Scottish Educational Journal* 12 Mar 1965.
6. See Appendix A for a full discussion of BQ.
7. Gibson (1912). His complaint is given in full in chapter 1 above.
8. In the years 1924-26 half of them came from Asia.
9. Simpson (1983) p 1.
10. *Journal of Education* Aug 1922.
11. Thomson (1969) p 99. The work began as a result of a chance meeting with Messer, chairman of the county's elementary education sub-committee.
12. This is discussed in more detail below. Not least among them was Lumsden, the inspector most responsible for encouraging the establishment of the English service.
13. Sutherland (1984) p 213.
14. Boyd (1930) p 274, casting some doubt on the claim by Richardson (1922) p 7 that "mental tests are now becoming so familiar in the English educational world that it is unnecessary ... to enter into a lengthy discussion of their nature".
15. Neill (1936) pp 138 and 159.
16. Boyd (1933) p 64.
17. *Ibid* p 101.
18. *Scots Magazine* Jan 1952 p 286. The article was by John Marshall, Rector of North Berwick High School.
19. In Rusk (1932) for example.
20. Wall (1956) p 17. Vernon (1950) more accurately speaks of developments in "Scotland, Birmingham and London".
21. Burt in letter to the author 3 Feb 1969.
22. Boyd *Autob* p 222.

23. Difficulty may seem to arise from the inclusion of 43 Belfast students in BQ but as the degree there was, for its entire life, run by Professors of Education and Psychology who were themselves holders of the Edinburgh degree and had modelled the Belfast degree upon it, little distortion is likely to result, especially as Belfast respondents form only some 8% of the total. The Scottish debt is freely acknowledged by Knox (1953b).
24. Walker of Aberdeen told BQ that he had always seen the degree "as being of honours standard rather than an honours degree". Even so, this distinction was not generally accepted and the Board of Studies in Glasgow (e.g. 22 Mar 1929) rigidly enforced the rule whereby Honours candidates are not allowed to resit failed examinations
25. BQ interview with Bairstow.
26. The informality of the arrangements, especially between the wars, often meant that there was an overlap of both course and teaching. (BQ interviews with Rusk and Bairstow.) The question of exemption was a matter for local decision and debate e.g. in the Glasgow University Pedagogical Society 25 Feb 1921.
27. Lee (1963) p 67.
28. Aber C 11 May 1926.
29. Nisbet (1967) pp 8-9.
30. Even as late as the 1960s it was common to hear of male secondary teachers being appointed as heads of Scottish primary schools in preference to experienced and expert female primary teachers.
31. Rudd and Simpson (1975) p 130.
32. Rudd and Simpson (1975) p 60 see greater mobility *into* a university as a mark of great esteem for almost 75% of the students in their survey of post-graduate students wished to stay where they had done their undergraduate course.
33. Anderson (1983) p 294.
34. Though some years were to elapse before it was officially recognised as an honours degree for salary purposes.
35. In Rudd and Simpson's sample 11% of their graduate students admitted to having as an aim the covering-up of a poor first degree. Rudd and Simpson (1975) pp 130-3 thought the gibe seems to have had more common currency in England in relation to far more than education courses for R.A. Butler (1968) p 39 feels it necessary to warn that "post-graduate courses should not be considered merely a means of making up for the weaknesses of earlier education". His call for such courses at such a late date reflects the shortage in England.
36. This may well be an underestimate, given that the increasingly

popular subject of Geography had, for technical reasons, to count in BQ as a science.

37. Semeonoff (1969) p 169.
38. Rudd and Simpson, in their sample, found 59% giving it as their main reason for embarking on post-graduate study. 36% cited a search for promotion and 13% a search for university employment. Rudd and Simpson (1975) p 133. Baker and Sikora (1981) p 13 found as teachers' reasons for involvement with INSET:
 - a. To improve my knowledge - 80%
 - b. To improve my teaching - 52%
 - c. To widen my experience - 47%
 - d. To improve my paper qualifications - 28%
39. Fleming in BQ interview.
40. E.g. in *Saltire* 15 Nov 1950 which mentions the "false impression" that the Diploma class consisted of graduates who, "devoid of sufficient low cunning to obtain reserved scholarships, have chosen this as an easy way of securing another year at university".
41. The fact that the proportion of those wishing to leave the profession is highest in Edinburgh. St. Andrews and Belfast, ie those with the highest proportion of non-Scottish students, may reflect the fact that, among Scottish teachers, becoming an education authority psychologist was not seen as "leaving the profession", given the triumph in official circles of Boyd's teacher-psychologist concept. See chapter 9 below.
42. Reith in BQ interview.
43. Rusk in BQ interview. At the very beginning of the Diploma's life, the withdrawal of Carnegie's funds seems to have caused a particular strain. Carnegie (1920).
44. Seth (1968) p 145. He described the existing degree as "ostensibly more than half in education".
45. Semeonoff in BQ interview.
46. See Hamilton (1985a).
47. Its public image was, if anything, even vaguer than that of education and it was often confused with psychiatry and psychoanalysis, "Freud, Jung and those boys" (Semeonoff (1969) p 170).
48. Lumsden (BQ) who describes Drever's course as "wide, general, solid and unbiased" and speaks of Thomson's "poetical philosophy,

biological approach and wide-ranging personal interests". See also the less flattering account by Seth (1968) pp 145-154.

49. This observation is based on papers and notebooks shown to the author by the early student, Bairstow.
50. BQ interview with Macallister. See also the content of Drever (1921).
51. Hearnshaw (1979) p 134. Boring (1950) p 478 also notes how "experimental psychology and individual psychology developed independently of each other".
52. Hearnshaw (1964) p 256.
53. BQ interview with Thouless.
54. Boyd Autob p 388.
55. BQ interview with Gardner.
56. McClelland (1946) p 19.
57. Seth (1968) pp 145-154.
58. In letter to the author *op cit* and see Hearnshaw (1979) p 99.
59. Glas Board of Studies 2 Feb 1949 when it was claimed that 50 honours students were being crowded into a laboratory designed for 30-35.
60. Scotland (1969b) p 189.
61. Nisbet (1967) p 14.
62. Rudd and Simpson (1975) p 88.
63. *Ibid.* p 29.
64. BQ interview with Bairstow and Walker.
65. Rugg (1947) p 723.
66. Shacklock Evans (1963) p 26.
67. BQ interview with Thouless.
68. BQ interview with Grant.
69. BQ interview with Fleming.
70. BQ interview with Gardner.
71. Boyd Autob p 390 "... I was never sure enough of the statistical methods involved ... I think if I had my university life to live over again I would get down to the statistical theories and methods thoroughly and not remain an amateur as I did."

72. BQ interview with Lumsden.
73. Boyd (1933) p 199.
74. Fleming (1933).
75. E.g. Thomson (1969) p 76.
76. Osborne (1966) p 99. It is doubtful, however, if his claim can be substantiated unless London theses are excluded.
77. The List of Officers for 1952-53, for example, included 13 holders of the degree.
78. For example in Young (1965) pp 110-111. Ironically, the same book places great reliance for the forming of its judgements on the Cambridge psychologist, Hudson.
79. Walker (1967) from circulated typescript.
80. SCRE (1949-54) *Aids to Educational Research*. Mackintosh (1962) was also explicitly though unsuccessfully, aimed at a BEd/EdB student audience.
81. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XIV Pt 1.
82. His debt to Rusk is acknowledged in the introduction to Dockrell (1984).
83. Wall and Husên (1968) p 6. He saw a turning point in 1958, thirty years after the EIS president for 1928-9 had declared that it was "more than time that Scotland was taking part in sifting, testing and examining ... by recognised scientific methods of investigation. EIS Congress Reports.
84. Tibble (1966) p 2.
85. Bell (1965) *passim*.
86. There were some differences between Glasgow and Edinburgh in the pre-1950 period. The latter, as might be expected, encouraged a larger number of theses in the statistical field (28.3%) compared with Glasgow (6.7%), though in both universities work on actual test construction seems to have been roughly similar in scale, 47.2% in Edinburgh, 41.3% in Glasgow. Despite Boyd's other interests, there was only one thesis in Philosophy at Glasgow and none in Edinburgh, while in History there was none in Glasgow and only one in Edinburgh. Glasgow, however, seems to have encouraged a greater interest in survey work, particularly when related to curriculum study (25.0%).
87. In Dockrell (1984) p 2. In Glasgow, the widening of the thesis topic is attributed to "wartime pressures" and in 1942 the Board of Studies officially allowed a wider range of topics so long as the matters dealt with were broadly psychological or educational. Glas Board of Studies 6 Mar 1942. In the 1958 Ordinance amending the form of the degree the thesis is declared to earn one quarter of

the total examination mark, presumably in order to satisfy BPS requirements.

88. As late as the 1940s such a feeling was still virulent in Oxford and Cambridge. Glover (1943) p 112, for example, notes that "happily a PhD if caught young, can be tamed" and a bitter article in the *Glasgow College Courant* J.A. Russell (Whitsun 1953) talks of the "fetish of the PhD" and criticises the "sheer proliferation" in Edinburgh and Glasgow. "Is all this research really necessary?" it asks.
89. Significantly the academic robes of the Edinburgh PhD are much less striking than elsewhere and it may have been intended that it should become a routine, rather than an exceptional degree.
90. Simpson (1983) *passim*. The first was instituted, with government instigation, at Oxford in 1917.

CHAPTER 9
THE DEGREE AND THE EDUCATION PROFESSIONS

1. The Degree and Subsequent Career

A number of attempts have been made to chart the subsequent careers of BEd/EdB graduates, notably by J. Nisbet (1962, 1973) who claimed to have traced "the present occupations" of no less than 93% of all graduates but such attempts have usually depended on collating the latest information contained in the address lists of the Departmental offices, information not necessarily either up to date or representative. By approaching ex-students directly, BQ intended to compile both a more accurate and more detailed picture of students' subsequent work patterns within the necessary constraints discussed in Appendix A. Much of its report, however, still remains at a level of simple enumeration, for any attempt at analysing in depth the interaction of course and subsequent career would be very difficult, indeed.

There are, for example, the other variables - previous work experience, national differences, the influence of other courses as well as personal circumstances and characteristics - that continually intervene and even more limited questions, such as the reasons for the choice of a particular career, or the worth of the course as a career preparation are themselves bedevilled by failures of memory, the deliberate distortions and concealments induced by self-respect and the shifting criteria of different periods. Would, for example, the training which was 'adequate' for a job in the 1930s prove 'adequate' for the same job in the 1960s and to which period's criteria would the respondent be expected to refer?

Many students chose to abandon or had to abandon their career intentions after joining the course. For example, 24.8% of those who had originally begun the course with "the desire to be an educational administrator" ended their career teaching in schools while 10.8% of those who had wanted to become psychologists also ended their career as school-teachers (table 15a). It is now impossible to say with certainty

what really changed their mind (or what sealed off their opportunity) with any real accuracy – and in particular whether the course was a help or a hindrance. Some disappointed graduates no doubt use it as a scapegoat to cover their own personal failings while successful graduates no doubt attribute to it out of a sense of loyalty to their teachers an influence over their career that is greatly exaggerated.

The complexity of seeking out an education career was graphically illustrated by one Edinburgh graduate of the 20s who found, when applying for posts, that the degree was still so unknown as 'to cut no ice' with English authorities advertising for assistant directors, and instead he applied for a job in Bengal under 'people who really knew about educational psychology'. He was interviewed in London by a distinguished panel including Nunn, Burt and Ballard but he worried about the climate and in the street met Darroch who offered him another job in a to him equally unattractive location. He then applied for an administrative post in Kent, followed by a vocational psychology job with Rowntree in York, who, he felt, like other Quaker firms, over-admired the degree.¹ To Drever's disgust, he turned their offer down on financial grounds. He then unsuccessfully applied for an Education Lectureship at Liverpool. Later, University College, Exeter offered him one but again his doctor advised that the climate was unsuitable and he ended up, to him unsatisfactorily, teaching a London external course at Portsmouth Technical College, despite the wholehearted patronage of both Darroch and Drever.

A fellow student, on the other hand, who had thought of nothing but teaching after taking the MA was tempted on to the BEd course by his future wife whose father had spotted the new degree in the Calendar and after a year at Columbia and a few terms in Moray House School, he found himself, as a result of Thomson's patronage, an important HMI in London at the age of 27.

In two such careers, starting at much the same stage in the degree's development, it is difficult to estimate its particular effect on their eventual occupational fate.

Table 15a

Reasons for embarking on the course related to longest and last job.
(percentages in brackets are percentages of total N)

Reasons for embarking on the course. A Longest B Last job		Desire to understand more fully the theoretical bases of education	Desire to train for educational research	Desire to become a qualified psychologist	Desire to become a Univ or college teacher	Desire to become an educational administrator	Desire to improve status as a school teacher	A way out of teaching
Teaching in Schools	A	91(34.9)	23(26.1)	29(16.0)	24(22.0)	44(32.1)	87(43.0)	12(26.7)
	B	58(22.2)	17(19.3)	19(10.8)	15(13.8)	34(24.8)	68(33.7)	4(8.9)
Coll/Univ Teaching or Research	A	83(31.8)	32(36.4)	54(29.8)	68(62.4)	26(19.0)	49(24.3)	17(37.8)
	B	109(41.8)	40(45.5)	64(36.4)	83(76.1)	38(27.7)	65(32.2)	23(51.1)
Educational Psychologist outside Coll/Univ	A	51(19.5)	15(17.0)	80(44.2)	9(8.3)	20(14.6)	37(18.3)	12(26.7)
	B	49(18.8)	13(14.8)	73(41.5)	3(2.8)	14(10.2)	34(16.8)	9(20.0)
Administration	A	30(11.5)	10(11.4)	4(2.2)	3(2.8)	35(25.5)	21(10.4)	4(8.9)
	B	39(14.9)	9(10.2)	6(3.4)	3(2.8)	35(25.5)	26(12.9)	6(13.3)
Other Professions or Business	A	6(2.3)	8(9.1)	9(5.1)	5(4.6)	12(8.8)	8(4.0)	0
	B	6(2.3)	9(10.2)	14(8.0)	5(4.6)	6(4.4)	9(4.5)	3(6.7)
Total N		261	88	176	109	137	202	45

Note: This table only includes those respondents who gave specific information on their later occupation.

Table 15b

Longest and last job related to reasons for embarking on the course.
(percentages in brackets are percentages of relevant totals of N)

Reasons for embarking on the course \ A Longest B Last Jobs		Teaching in Schools	Coll/Univ Teaching or Research	Educational Psychologist outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administrator	Other Professions or Business
Desire to understand more fully the theoretical bases of education	A	91(59.0)	83(54.2)	51(41.8)	30(57.7)	6(30.0)
	B	58(52.7)	109(56.8)	49(43.0)	39(66.1)	6(27.3)
Desire to train for educational research	A	23(14.9)	32(20.9)	15(12.3)	10(19.2)	8(40.0)
	B	17(15.5)	40(20.8)	13(11.4)	9(15.3)	9(40.9)
Desire to become a qualified psychologist	A	29(18.8)	54(35.3)	80(65.6)	4(7.7)	9(45.0)
	B	19(17.3)	64(33.3)	73(64.0)	6(10.2)	14(63.6)
Desire to become a Univ/Coll teacher	A	24(15.6)	68(44.4)	9(7.4)	3(5.8)	5(25.0)
	B	15(13.6)	83(43.2)	3(2.6)	3(5.1)	5(22.7)
Desire to become an educational administrator	A	44(28.6)	26(17.0)	20(16.4)	35(67.3)	12(60.0)
	B	34(30.9)	38(19.8)	14(12.3)	35(59.3)	6(27.3)
Desire to improve status as a school-teacher	A	87(56.5)	49(32.0)	37(30.3)	21(40.4)	8(40.0)
	B	68(61.8)	65(33.9)	34(29.8)	26(44.1)	9(40.9)
As a way out of teaching	A	12(7.8)	17(11.1)	12(9.8)	4(7.7)	0
	B	4(3.6)	23(12.0)	9(7.9)	6(10.2)	3(13.6)
N	A	154	153	122	52	20
	B	110	192	114	59	22

What is certain, however, is that little significance could have been attached to the nature of their first job after graduating and BQ therefore makes a necessary distinction between (a) this *first* job, which though it might be the respondent's life-work, might just as easily be a temporary make-shift, or simply an earlier job continued until a more suitable post presented itself; (b) the *last* job, which again might be life-long or some glorious final achievement, but could just as easily be a temporary wartime or post-retirement post unrelated to the main career; and (c) the *longest* job, which could, of course, also be the first or last. It was felt that it was this category of *longest* that gave the best evidence of the graduate's contribution to the educational system although unfortunately this is not a distinction always made by those celebrating the BEd/EdB graduates' influence. Only in 55.8% of cases was the BQ respondent's *first* job also his or her *longest* and only in 39% of cases was it the *last*.

Tables 16 to 18 detail the *first*, *last* and *longest* jobs of respondents while table 19 relates the *last* job to the *longest*. Because school-teaching provided 56.7% of first jobs, 19.1% of last jobs and 28.3% of longest, a spot check of students taken a year after graduation would therefore have overestimated by some 100% the extent of graduate commitment to that career while a survey of most recent jobs would have considerably underestimated graduate commitment to that career over the previous half century. At the same time, the presence among BQ respondents of so many recent graduates, many of them in *first* jobs may well have exaggerated the overall commitment to school-teaching.

Both tables 17 and 18 interestingly demonstrate the limited extent to which graduates have devoted themselves to educational administration, at least outside universities and colleges. If graduates really did, as the EIS had originally envisaged, take over the leadership of the education service in Scotland (a doubtful proposition discussed earlier) then it was more likely to be as a teacher of teachers, in the colleges and universities, than as head teacher, principal teacher of a subject,

Table 16

First job after B.Ed./Ed.B. graduation.
(percentages in brackets)

	School Teaching*	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration	Other Posts ⁺	No Info
Belfast	14(32.6)	8(18.6)	11(25.6)	0	0	
Aberdeen	50(63.3)	11(13.9)	11(13.9)	2(2.5)	5(6.3)	
Edinburgh pre-1950	28(52.8)	10(18.9)	4(7.5)	6(11.3)	5(9.4)	
" post-1950	34(49.3)	18(26.1)	13(18.8)	1(1.4)	1(1.4)	2(2.9)
" total	62(50.8)	28(23.0)	17(13.9)	7(5.7)	6(4.9)	2(1.6)
Glasgow pre-1950	70(67.3)	13(12.5)	14(13.5)	4(3.8)	2(1.9)	1(1.0)
" post-1950	65(57.5)	22(19.5)	18(15.9)	2(1.8)	1(0.9)	5(4.4)
" part-time	109(60.2)	32(17.7)	28(15.5)	6(3.3)	1(0.6)	5(2.8)
" full-time	26(72.2)	3(8.3)	4(11.1)	0	2(5.6)	1(2.8)
" total	135(62.2)	35(16.1)	32(14.7)	6(2.8)	3(1.4)	6(2.8)
St Andrews	26(50.0)	9(17.3)	7(13.5)	0	9(17.3)	1(1.9)
Part-time	138(57.7)	42(17.6)	40(16.7)	10(4.2)	3(1.3)	6(2.5)
Full-time	159(58.0)	49(17.9)	38(13.9)	5(1.8)	20(7.3)	3(1.1)
Male	214(60.8)	67(19.0)	33(9.4)	14(4.0)	20(5.7)	6(1.7)
Female	61(49.6)	16(13.0)	39(31.7)	1(0.8)	3(2.4)	3(2.4)
1930s	65(75.6)	9(10.5)	3(3.5)	3(3.4)	3(3.4)	3(3.4)
1940s	50(47.1)	19(17.9)	21(19.8)	9(8.5)	7(6.6)	
1950s	126(63.3)	27(13.6)	28(14.1)	3(1.5)	11(5.5)	4(2.0)
1960s	55(46.2)	35(29.4)	25(21.0)	0	2(1.7)	2(1.7)
Total	297(57.9)	91(17.7)	78(15.2)	15(2.9)	23(4.5)	9(1.8)

* Including Further Education

+ These included temporary military service

Table 17

Longest job after B.Ed./Ed.B. graduation.
(percentages in brackets)

	School* Teaching	College/Univ Lecturing and research	Educational Psychology outside College/Univ	Educational Administration	Other posts	No info
Belfast	10(23.3)	14(32.6)	18(41.9)	0	1(2.3)	0
Aberdeen	30(38.0)	19(24.1)	17(21.5)	9(11.4)	4(5.1)	0
Edinburgh pre-1950	10(18.8)	17(32.1)	12(22.6)	12(22.6)	2(3.8)	0
" post-1950	19(27.5)	26(37.7)	11(15.9)	8(11.6)	3(4.3)	2(2.9)
" total	29(23.8)	43(35.2)	23(18.9)	20(16.4)	5(4.1)	2(1.6)
Glasgow pre-1950	27(26.0)	34(32.7)	25(24.0)	12(11.5)	3(2.9)	3(2.9)
" post-1950	39(34.5)	29(25.7)	28(24.8)	8(7.1)	3(2.7)	6(5.3)
" part-time	53(29.3)	48(26.5)	49(27.1)	17(9.4)	6(3.3)	8(4.4)
" full-time	13(36.1)	15(41.7)	4(11.1)	3(8.3)	0	1(2.8)
" total	66(30.4)	63(29.0)	53(24.4)	20(9.2)	6(2.8)	9(4.1)
St Andrews	19(36.5)	14(26.9)	11(21.2)	3(5.8)	4(7.7)	1(1.9)
Part-time	73(30.5)	62(25.9)	64(26.8)	24(10.0)	7(2.9)	9(3.8)
Full-time	71(25.9)	91(33.2)	58(21.2)	28(10.2)	12(4.4)	3(1.1)
Male	112(31.8)	109(31.0)	60(17.0)	48(13.6)	18(5.1)	5(1.4)
Female	28(22.8)	34(27.6)	53(43.1)	3(2.4)	1(0.8)	4(3.3)
1930s	25(29.1)	28(26.7)	9(10.5)	17(19.8)	5(5.8)	
1940s	23(21.7)	30(28.3)	33(31.1)	15(14.2)	4(3.8)	
1950s	69(34.7)	48(24.1)	51(25.6)	17(8.5)	9(4.5)	
1960s	38(31.9)	47(39.5)	28(23.5)	2(1.7)	2(1.7)	
Total	154(30.0)	153(29.8)	122(23.8)	52(10.1)	20(3.9)	12(2.3)

* Including Further Education

Table 18

Last job after B.Ed./Ed.B. graduation.
(percentages in brackets)

	School Teaching*	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration	Other posts	No info
Belfast	8(18.6)	17(39.5)	16(37.2)	1(2.3)	1(2.3)	0
Aberdeen	15(19.0)	31(39.2)	14(17.7)	12(15.2)	6(7.6)	1(1.3)
Edinburgh pre-1950	9(17.0)	18(34.0)	12(22.6)	9(17.0)	5(9.4)	0
" post-1950	13(18.8)	34(49.3)	11(15.9)	8(11.6)	1(1.4)	0
" total	22(18.0)	52(42.6)	23(18.9)	17(13.9)	6(4.9)	2(1.6)
Glasgow pre-1950	26(25.0)	33(31.7)	24(23.1)	14(13.5)	6(5.8)	1(1.0)
" post-1950	23(20.4)	42(37.2)	27(23.9)	11(9.7)	3(2.7)	7(6.1)
" part-time	38(21.0)	62(34.3)	46(25.4)	21(11.6)	7(3.9)	7(3.9)
" full-time	11(30.6)	13(36.1)	5(13.9)	4(11.1)	2(5.6)	1(2.8)
" total	49(22.6)	75(34.6)	51(23.5)	25(11.5)	9(4.1)	8(3.7)
St Andrews	16(30.8)	17(32.7)	10(19.2)	4(7.7)	4(7.7)	1(1.9)
Part-time	51(21.3)	82(34.3)	59(24.7)	31(13.0)	8(3.3)	8(3.3)
Full-time	59(21.5)	110(40.1)	55(20.0)	28(10.2)	18(6.6)	4(1.5)
Male	77(21.9)	141(40.1)	52(14.8)	53(15.1)	23(6.5)	6(1.7)
Female	23(18.7)	37(30.1)	53(43.1)	4(3.3)	2(1.6)	4(3.3)
1930s	25(29.1)	32(37.2)	7(8.1)	14(16.3)	6(7.0)	2(2.3)
1940s	19(17.9)	30(28.3)	32(30.2)	17(16.0)	8(7.5)	0
1950s	39(19.6)	72(36.2)	48(24.1)	24(12.1)	9(4.5)	7(3.5)
1960s	27(22.7)	58(48.7)	26(21.8)	3(2.5)	3(2.5)	2(1.7)
Total	110(21.4)	192(37.4)	114(22.2)	59(11.5)	26(5.1)	12(2.3)

* Including Further Education

Table 19

Last job related to the longest.
(percentages are of totals A & B)

Longest Last Job	School Teaching*	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration	Others	Total A
School- Teaching*	100 A 90.9 B 64.9	7 A 6.4 B 4.6	1 A 0.9 B 0.8	1 A 0.9 B 1.9	1 A 0.9 B 5.0	110
Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	30 A 15.6 B 19.5	141 A 73.4 B 92.2	15 A 7.8 B 12.3	4 A 2.1 B 7.7	2 A 1.0 B 10.0	192
Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	9 A 7.9 B 5.8	2 A 1.8 B 1.3	102 A 89.5 B 83.6		1 A 0.9 B 5.0	114
Educational Administration	11 A 18.6 B 7.1	1 A 1.7 B 0.7	1 A 1.7 B 0.8	46 A 78.0 B 88.5		59
Others	4 A 15.4 B 2.6	2 A 7.7 B 1.3	3 A 11.5 B 2.5	1 A 3.8 B 1.9	16 A 61.5 B 80.0	26
Total B	154	153	122	52	20	

* Including Further Education

administrator or local authority psychologist, for no less than 37.4% of BQ graduates eventually found a job in the college/university sector.

Nor did taking the degree change the immediate course of individuals' careers as much as might have been expected. In the financially depressed conditions of the 20s and 30s, it was very easy to be tempted back into or to remain in school-teaching and some early students seem never to have considered that taking the course might or should involve a move out of such a career (the early view of Boyd himself as we shall see later). Over half of the respondents (55.0%) denied that any change had occurred though this seems to be in part explained by college lecturers seeing their taking up of such a post as a natural progression *within* the career structure of teaching, while only some 11% felt that they had been persuaded to change the course of their career through the influence of a university teacher.

For 44% of those whose first job lay in primary teaching, it was also to be their longest job and the same was true for 45.4% of 'first job' secondary teachers, while for 16% of the former and 10.2% of the latter, it simply led to their being trainers of teachers in the same sectors, while a sizeable proportion of teachers (25.3% of primary and 15.3% of secondary) probably remained in post while seeking appointments in the psychology service.

It was noted earlier that 24.8% of those who joined the course wishing to become an educational administrator actually ended their careers in school-teaching and certainly open-ended responses make it clear how difficult it sometimes was to get such appointments even in the post-1945 period. A 1950 graduate spoke of waiting 15 years before final success while a 1952 graduate, ironically enough, found it difficult 'because there were still so many ex-service EdBs on the market'. As late as 1967 one graduate had even failed to get such a post because the marks on his *first* degree had not been good enough, demonstrating continuing doubts about the education degree in that particular sector. It is interesting to note also that whereas

some 14% of intending college/university lecturers seem to have eventually achieved their ambition by the end of their career, even though it was not their "longest" job, the percentage of intending administrators who achieved their ambition was the same, 25.5%, in both the "last" and "longest" categories, suggesting that administration, unlike a college or university career was not one that could be easily entered at a late stage in one's career.

Recruits to the psychology service found things much easier, especially in the post-war period. A 1951 graduate reported that he was appointed to the first job he applied for and in 1958 things were reported to be 'very, very easy, in fact too easy if anything', while in Manchester in 1963 a Glasgow graduate found himself one of three candidates for three posts. A 1965 graduate who had not even chosen the psychology specialism which by then appeared to be obligatory for BPS recognition, found himself being rung up at home by principal psychologists from as far away as London, anxious to obtain his services once his graduation was announced.

Only during the war when it was felt necessary to direct as many psychologists into government service as possible and during the teacher shortage of the early sixties when certain psychology posts were frozen, did things sometimes prove more complicated, and in particular it remained difficult for women candidates who were not readily able to move home. However, the influence of this should not be exaggerated. 94.3% of women graduates were unmarried at the time of graduation, though some no doubt had domestic commitments to parents and other relatives.

The failure of original intentions was not therefore always the result of a shortage of posts. Naturally some students simply changed their mind. The course, in some cases, through deepening educational insights, seems actually to have enhanced the attractions of school-teaching itself, or at least to have awoken greater hopes of promotion. In some cases it redirected teachers to more congenial sectors of school-teaching. One St. Andrews graduate, for example, had happily transferred from

junior secondary to primary remedial teaching after completing the course. Moreover, there is some evidence that a number of dissatisfied teachers had originally looked to psychology not so much for a new career as for a form of personal therapy, which once administered, either cured or disillusioned them. Two respondents explored such experiences at length in their BQ response while the doctor brother of a recently dead graduate, who returned BQ unanswered, took the opportunity to blame the course for his sister's suicide. Others may well have stayed in teaching for a few years, like the young inspector mentioned earlier, in order to widen their educational experience before embarking on more specialised tasks outside the schools, and one Glasgow teacher had even postponed his entry to the psychology service until he was able to take early retirement from school-teaching at 60, thus demonstrating once again how freely psychology posts were available in the 1960s.

The ease with which psychology appointments could be found may also help to explain why only 64% of those who ended their career as educational psychologists had had it in mind when they joined the course (table 15b) though presumably exposure to a hitherto largely unexplored discipline must also have awoken new enthusiasms in some candidates.

Respondents were also asked about the course as a *preparation* for their subsequent career and whether it later seemed 'worthwhile' in terms of that career. As with the course in general, there was a high degree of satisfaction, 89.9% finding it 'worthwhile', rising to 96.3% in the case of pre-1950 Edinburgh and in no grouping did the satisfaction index fall below 87%. At the same time the number who had found the degree an *essential* preparation for that career, presumably making a distinction between its general educational value and its value as a piece of technical training, was smaller (table 20). As many as 17.7% in Aberdeen and 14.5% in post-1950 Edinburgh were unsure about its technical or professional value, with the pre-1950 graduates more satisfied than their younger colleagues, reflecting, perhaps, the less complex demands made of educational experts in the first half of the century.

Table 20

General feelings about the course as a preparation for subsequent career.
(percentages in brackets)

		Course not essential for subsequent career	Course proved a necessary preparation to career	Course did not prove a necessary preparation to career	Unsure on the subject	Course adequate as far as it went	No Info
Total		73(14.2)	297(57.9)	42(8.2)	54(10.5)	31(6.0)	16(3.1)
Belfast		3(7.0)	24(55.8)	2(4.6)	9(20.9)	3(7.0)	2(4.6)
Aberdeen		13(16.5)	41(51.9)	9(11.4)	14(17.7)	2(2.5)	0
Edinburgh	pre-1950	5(9.4)	41(77.4)	2(3.8)	2(3.8)	3(5.7)	
"	post-1950	7(10.1)	42(60.9)		10(14.5)	6(8.7)	4(5.8)
"	total	12(9.8)	83(68.0)	2(1.6)	12(9.8)	9(7.4)	4(3.3)
Glasgow	pre-1950	11(10.6)	74(71.2)	4(3.9)	6(5.8)	7(6.7)	2(1.9)
"	post-1950	17(15.0)	53(46.9)	20(17.7)	10(8.9)	8(7.1)	5(4.4)
"	part-time	23(12.7)	105(58.0)	20(11.1)	13(7.2)	14(7.7)	6(3.3)
"	full-time	5(13.9)	22(61.1)	4(11.1)	3(8.3)	1(2.8)	1(2.8)
"	total	28(12.9)	127(58.5)	24(11.1)	16(7.4)	15(6.9)	7(3.2)
St Andrews		17(32.7)	22(42.3)	5(9.6)	3(5.8)	2(3.9)	3(5.8)
Part-time		35(14.6)	133(55.7)	25(10.5)	22(9.2)	15(6.3)	9(3.8)
Full-time		38(13.9)	164(59.9)	17(6.2)	32(11.7)	16(5.8)	7(2.6)
1930s		7(8.1)	60(69.8)	1(1.2)	10(11.6)	3(3.5)	5(5.8)
1940s		13(12.3)	76(71.7)	6(5.7)	3(2.8)	8(7.5)	
1950s		31(15.6)	100(50.3)	24(12.1)	24(12.1)	15(7.5)	5(2.5)
1960s		22(18.5)	59(49.6)	11(9.2)	16(13.4)	5(4.2)	6(5.0)

Certainly, in 1960 the head of the Edinburgh authority's psychology service, herself an early graduate, expressed misgivings about current training in the face of recent developments and set up a special committee to propose reforms, though it has to be said that thirty years earlier, in Dunbartonshire, she had expressed similar dissatisfaction with Boyd's products in the West of Scotland.²

Table 21a indicates the course areas which awoke the greatest enthusiasm among those whose *longest* job lay in particular careers. In view of the mistrust of psychological theory said to be found in serving teachers, it is of interest that it proved to be the most popular area for school-teacher respondents, with a higher rating in some groupings than among the professional psychologists themselves. The same enthusiasm is also shown, perhaps equally surprisingly, by administrators, though this may in part reflect their subsequent concern with secondary selection. On the other hand, of course, it may simply be evidence of good psychology teaching. Philosophy also gets generally high scores, again giving support to the original Darroch/Drever generalist view of the course's nature. Such enthusiasms are particularly striking, given that Philosophy along with Psychology and its cognate areas were often those areas that the same occupational groups had found particularly difficult.

At the same time it is General Psychology which scored most highly overall as an *uncongenial* subject (table 21b) even when it was *not* found particularly difficult, though in table 21c it also, somewhat surprisingly, gets the highest ratings *as* a difficult subject among the professional psychologists themselves with no less than 60.7% of them finding it especially difficult. It was also considered to have been given undue emphasis by 15.6% of the professional psychologists, though yet again it emerged from BQ as the most popular candidate for greater emphasis, demonstrating once more the heterogeneous nature of the student body, and the many approaches that can be made to psychology and its uses.

Table 21a Areas of course awakening 'special enthusiasm'
 in professional groups.+
 (percentages of A in brackets)

Area of study which awoke enthusiasm \ A Longest job	School Teaching	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration
Psychology (General)	96(62.3)	101(66.0)	76(62.3)	31(59.6)
Child Psychology	52(33.8)	50(32.7)	38(31.1)	15(28.8)
"Scientific" Psychology	25(16.2)	42(27.5)	27(22.1)	8(15.4)
Social Psychology	13(8.4)	16(10.5)	19(15.6)	
Educational Psychology	51(33.1)	69(45.1)	46(37.7)	16(30.8)
Applied Psychology	62(40.3)	66(43.1)	49(40.2)	20(38.5)
Experimental Education	34(22.1)	47(30.7)	20(16.4)	13(25.0)
History Alone	20(13.0)	13(8.5)	10(8.2)	7(13.5)
History and Administration	22(14.3)	13(8.5)	10(8.2)	
Philosophy	36(23.4)	48(31.4)	32(26.2)	20(38.5)
Comparative Education	35(22.7)	9(5.9)	5(4.1)	8(15.4)
Sociology	14(9.1)	16(10.5)	18(14.8)	

+ These categories of subject are not exclusive. Being based on responses to an open-ended question, it is impossible to gauge overlap.

Table 21b

Areas of course⁺ found "uncongenial though
not particularly difficult".

Areas especially uncongenial though not difficult	Longest job	School Teaching	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration
Psychology (General)		30(19.5)	34(22.2)	25(20.5)	10(9.2)
Child Psychology		12(7.8)	17(11.1)	18(14.8)	6(11.5)
Scientific Psychology		12(7.8)	15(9.8)	9(7.4)	
Educational Psychology		12(7.8)	22(14.4)	18(14.8)	6(11.5)
Applied Psychology		12(7.8)	17(11.1)	17(13.9)	6(11.5)
Experimental Education		10(6.5)	17(11.1)	55(45.1)	5(9.6)
History and Administration		19(12.3)	29(19.0)	14(11.5)	5(9.6)
History Alone		15(9.7)	24(15.7)	12(9.8)	
Philosophy		6(3.9)	11(7.2)		

⁺ These categories of subject are not exclusive. Being based on responses to an open-ended question, it is impossible to gauge overlap.

Table 21c

Areas of course⁺ found "especially difficult"
in professional groups

Area of study found "especially difficult" \ Longest job	School Teaching	Coll/Univ Lecturing and Research	Educational Psychology outside Coll/Univ	Educational Administration
Psychology (General)	65(42.2)	67(43.8)	74(60.7)	13(25.0)
Child Psychology	34(22.1)	37(24.2)	30(24.6)	7(13.5)
Scientific Psychology	14(9.1)	13(8.5)	15(12.3)	
Educational Psychology	52(33.8)	57(37.3)	62(50.8)	12(23.1)
Applied Psychology	48(31.2)	49(32.0)	59(48.4)	12(23.1)
Experimental Education	47(30.5)	49(32.0)	56(45.9)	12(23.1)
History and Administration	6(3.9)	5(3.3)		
History Alone	5(3.2)			
Philosophy	5(3.2)	6(3.9)	7(5.7)	

⁺ These categories of subject are not exclusive. Being based on responses to an open-ended question, it is impossible to gauge overlap.

The major criticism of the course from a professional point of view seems to have been concerned with the inadequate coverage of the shape and functioning of current educational structures as opposed to their historical origins. A knowledge of the modern Scottish school system seems to have been too often taken for granted, even where non-Scottish students were concerned.

Only a minority of students, 17% at most, seem to have found difficulty in obtaining a post at the end of the course, though there were greater difficulties for some groups than for others, while the posts actually found were not always of a type the graduate was seeking.

A remarkably high proportion of full-time students (20.4%) were already promised an immediate post even if it was not in the end to prove their longest and 29.6% claimed that they were not seeking a job. In this respect there seemed to be no great difference between men and women.

On the other hand, as table 22 makes clear, only 39.9% of those seeking a job were willing to say that the degree was an advantage. There is some indication that the advantages were greater in the latter part of the degree's history but the small number of responses involved makes this difficult to judge, especially as it is not known how far those not seeking a job had already been guaranteed one on the basis of holding the degree.

62.4% of those who had to seek a job declared that they had "no difficulty" with only a slight difference between male and female (62.2% male, 59.3% female) as table 23 indicates.

Even so, the ease with which posts could be found varied from profession to profession as was indicated earlier and it is therefore worth examining the relationship of the degree to the main professions in more detail.

Table 22 Advantage of holding the degree when seeking a job
(Percentages in brackets are of those seeking a job)

	Of Advantage	No Advantage	No Information
Belfast	16(47.0)	4(11.8)	14(41.2)
Aberdeen	20(37.0)	5(9.3)	29(53.7)
Edinburgh pre-1950	15(39.5)	4(10.5)	19(50.0)
" post-1950	24(43.6)	2(3.6)	29(52.7)
" total	39(41.9)	6(6.5)	48(51.6)
Glasgow pre-1950	20(30.3)	4(6.1)	42(63.6)
" post-1950	29(42.0)	6(8.7)	34(49.3)
" total	49(36.3)	10(7.4)	76(56.3)
St Andrews	18(45.0)	4(10.0)	18(45.0)
Male	97(40.2)	23(9.5)	121(50.2)
Female	31(38.3)	6(7.4)	44(54.3)
1930s	22(34.4)	8(12.5)	34(53.1)
1940s	21(30.0)	1(1.4)	48(68.6)
1950s	57(40.7)	17(12.1)	66(47.1)
1960s	41(50.6)	3(3.7)	37(45.7)
Total	142(39.9)	29(8.1)	185(52.0)

Table 23 Difficulties experienced by those graduates
 who had to seek a post.
 (Percentage of those seeking post in brackets)

	Experienced difficulty	Experienced no difficulty	No information or went directly to war service
Belfast	10(29.4)	23(67.6)	1(2.9)
Aberdeen	11(20.4)	37(68.5)	6(11.1)
Edinburgh pre-1950	10(26.3)	19(50.0)	9(23.7)
" post-1950	19(34.5)	33(60.0)	3(5.5)
" total	29(31.2)	52(55.9)	12(12.9)
Glasgow pre-1950	9(13.6)	42(63.6)	15(22.7)
" post-1950	16(23.2)	43(62.3)	10(14.5)
" total	25(18.5)	85(63.0)	25(18.5)
St Andrews	10(25.0)	25(62.5)	5(12.5)
Male	60(24.9)	150(62.2)	31(12.9)
Female	21(25.9)	48(59.3)	12(14.8)
1930s	20(31.3)	34(53.1)	10(15.6)
1940s	5(7.1)	47(67.1)	18(25.7)
1950s	37(26.4)	89(63.6)	14(10.0)
1960s	22(27.2)	52(64.2)	7(8.6)
Total	85(23.9)	222(62.4)	49(13.8)

2. The degree and the local education service

The operation of the 1918 Act which had established for the first time in Scotland a system of *ad hoc* City and County education authorities to replace the School Boards³ had also provided a clear opportunity for the development of an administrative profession for whose task the new degree's syllabus might well be particularly relevant. As Clark, clerk to the recently defunct Glasgow School Board had put it,

'we are readjusting our educational perspective, (for) the recent Act has ... put the work of the educational administrator on a basis such as it has never had before'

and he indicated how the Directors in the English local authorities, now 16 years old, had "(reduced) to order the chaotic and unrelated elements of English education". He also believed that the work of these directors must involve 'the free use of well-adapted experiments in teaching and organisation' and that each Director should be 'first and foremost an educationist, capable of offering advice on educational issues and policy ... a man who had made a professional and scientific study of education'.⁴

In other words, speaking as someone with direct experience of administering the country's largest authority, he shared the American, Cubberley's vision of a specially trained profession of educational administrators standing between the teachers on the one hand and the politicians on the other.⁵ The Scottish Education Department in its first circular following the operation of the Act (1919) looked in particular for *professional* strength in the new Education Authority administrator. 'The members,' it said, 'will have to look to him for expert advice upon a variety of technical questions and for that reason, if for no other, it will probably be found desirable that he should be a man who combines *educational* experience with an approved capacity for administration'⁶ - if only as a defender of the new system against what a later minute (of 1922) called the numerous 'faddists' among the members of the education authorities.⁷

In fact, however, as the latter minute pointed out, despite all these hopes, the profession of administrator continued to remain weak, having no fixed salary scale or security of tenure and by the time the 1918 *ad hoc* authorities disappeared in 1929, thirty of the chief officials still had no administrative assistance of any kind, while many of them had to hold down more than one job.⁸ The Glasgow director, for example, in addition to his educational duties, had also to act as the authority's treasurer, clerk and legal adviser.⁹ Thus the post was unlikely to attract an educationist pure and simple rather than the lawyers who had traditionally occupied administrative posts in Scotland. Only seventeen of the *ad hoc* authorities ever appointed any education director at all¹⁰ and of those who were appointed some were simply ex-headmasters with no academic experience of educational studies beyond their initial teacher-training¹¹ - if they were, indeed, young enough to have been compelled to undergo even that. Insofar as they had post-graduate qualifications these tended to be traditional doctorates in legal and literary subjects, thus ranging them alongside many of the university elements most sceptical about psychology and experimental education. Figures such as Hepburn and Third in Ayrshire and Robertson in Dundee, who did have some experience of German pedagogical study, were very much the exception in an administrative service which for the moment largely turned its back on the new German/American inspired degree.

In fact, there must be some suspicion that the absence of true educationists in such posts may well have been to Struthers' own taste, despite the encouragement afforded in the Blue Books and Circulars by the still comparatively independent Inspectorate. He had already taken office when Craik, who had presumably discussed such issues with him, published an article on the subject early in 1909. "Educational administration," he had suggested, is no longer a sphere which can be dominated by the teaching profession. That profession should have ample latitude of authority within the walls of the school and its experience must necessarily guide our advance ... But Education is now a branch ... of civil administration (and) the wise student

(wishing to enter it) will seek no special course of training."¹²

Certainly it became normal for Scots seeking even important posts *not* to think of special training. It was announced, for example in February 1932 that Dr A. Scotland from Glasgow had been appointed assistant Director of Education for Stoke-on-Trent¹³ without benefit of EdB. Four years earlier the *Journal of Education* had noted the total absence of Columbia-style training courses in England¹⁴ and despite the existence of the Scottish degree, it was certainly possible to ignore it. Sir W. Arbuckle, under-secretary at the SED from 1952 to 1963 had actually trained as a teacher in Moray House but had taken neither the University Diploma nor Degree, while many of the influential figures within the new unelected bodies employed by SED in the government of Scottish education had no strong university links and certainly no special degree.

Perhaps it is not surprising, therefore, that it was not until their conference in Ayr in November 1936¹⁵ that the Association of Directors, discussing mental testing, was to suggest that 'it was necessary for directors to have associated with them individuals either on their staff or any teachers who (were) familiar with 'this modern technique' and in doing so were responding to events in England where Birmingham (with Scottish BEd help) had begun to build up the first regular psychological service, but this stopped far short of suggesting that their own membership now needed the broad training in education theory and psychology that the education degrees provided. At earlier meetings the Directors had discussed such subjects as Plato's likely attitude to the 1918 Act and at this same Ayr conference they discussed the views not only of Plato but of John Knox, while in Elgin two years later¹⁶ they again returned to a detailed study of Plato's view of educational objectives. It was not surprising therefore to find a speaker at the Pitlochry conference in 1939 claiming that philosophy and the curriculum were of far more interest than experimental education to education committees 'who were inclined to view research as being too remote from practical administration'.¹⁷

Any real professional interest in all but the philosophical wares of the university departments had apparently to await the educational reconstruction of the 1940s and Skinner, writing in 1942 (no doubt as part of his campaign to launch the degree in St. Andrews) had to echo the words of Clark a quarter of a century earlier speaking of the 'new and burgeoning career structure' in the administration and inspectorate, relating it, as if for the first time, to the importance of the testing movement and the clinics.¹⁸

At Callander in November 1943, to the astonishment of the universities, the Association of Directors expressed its regret that there was no form of training in Scotland for Heads, Inspectors, Training College Lecturers or Directors of education¹⁹ - a remarkable sentiment twenty five years after the education degree's establishment, though hardly a surprising one in view of the fact that their call two years earlier for an Educational Staff College had seen its setting up as being the responsibility of the Colleges or of the SED without the University Departments being mentioned.²⁰ Some delegates even took the opportunity at the same meeting to protest at the nuisance caused by Bachelor of Education students and their questionnaires, a curious sentiment, perhaps, given that the Education Authorities had been co-founders, with Boyd's Research Committee, of SCRE thirteen years earlier.

Even so, it was not until October 1950, more than thirty years after the passing of the Ordinances that the Directors, at Bridge of Allen, expressed a direct interest in the degree and its functioning. The Association then decided to set up a working party on financial support for the BEd/EdB,²¹ yet S. Nisbet on returning to Scotland from Belfast two years later to take up the new Glasgow chair, had to tell their Nethybridge conference that he still 'saw some evidence of a distrust or depreciation of educational theory on the part of administrators' and spoke of the need for a far more active support of the BEd/EdB.²²

To some extent the Directors' neglect of the universities' services may, of course, be blamed on the universities themselves. Boyd and McClelland, in their New

Education Fellowship, hardly revealed themselves as supporters of the *status quo* while Boyd, in any case, saw his own degree as being aimed primarily at teachers and budding psychologists²³ rather than at those whose job was to maintain and not merely develop the system while Thomson though, anxious to recruit possible or actual administrators,²⁴ seemed to worry little about their lack of interest in testing, being apparently quite happy when such matters were left in the hands of the medical officers of health, with whose staff he and Drever had many contacts.²⁵

Given such a background, it is not surprising that though the 1950s were to see a major increase in the numbers of education graduates entering local administration, the degree was never to become a condition of employment or promotion in the way that similar American qualifications had done and by 1960, only 11 directors out of 35 were holders of the degree.²⁶ Moreover, these did not include such important authorities as Dundee, Edinburgh, Ayrshire or Lanarkshire. Indeed, in the case of Dundee and Ayrshire, the position so far as the educational training of the director was concerned, seemed less satisfactory than thirty years earlier²⁷ and although by the time of BQ (1967) the situation had improved somewhat, 15 directors out of 35 now being degree holders, only one of the four major authorities mentioned above, Edinburgh, had by this time appointed an education graduate.²⁸

According to BQ, only one in ten of all graduates found their way into administrative posts and the wide reputation of the degree as a preparation for work in that area²⁹ seems to have depended less on large numbers than on the conspicuous success of certain individuals. In Scotland itself the Edinburgh graduate, McIntosh, was not merely a highly successful Director in Fife and the initiator there of many experiments and research programmes receiving wide attention, but was also a leading and influential figure on many national bodies relating to examinations, curriculum and research. Moreover he continually reminded audiences of his debt to Thomson's teaching, and in typical BEd fashion ended his career in a College, occupying Thomson's former post as Principal of Moray House. Other

Thomson/Drever products, notably Lumsden and Rodger, became influential figures in government service while a Glasgow graduate was not only an influential Director in Sheffield but became, as Sir William Alexander, the head of the main consultative body of the English and Welsh LEAs and the chief negotiator with both government and teachers, ending his career in the House of Lords. He also is one of those who freely acknowledges that his EdB experience under Boyd was the basis of his career.³⁰

On the other hand, the impact of such figures must not be allowed too much significance when gauging the general national impact of the degree on local government for there has perhaps been too glib an extrapolation of the later usefulness of the degree among those organising post-war secondary selection, into an earlier period. Thus in the late 1930s only three BEd/EdBs (McClelland, N. Walker and Hepburn) were appointed to the Scottish committee of the International Inquiry into examinations and selection and although the two chief assistants - Young and McIntosh - were holders of the degree, none of the group leaders - meant to be skilled in advanced statistical methods - was so and only one of the thirty seven teachers involved as investigators.³¹

There has also been a common assumption that the products of Thomson's department in particular were all evangelists for mental testing who soon began to impose his methods on the local qualifying examinations and thus on the heartland of Scottish education. Such an idea was no doubt encouraged by the assertions of Simon and Banks that mental measurement of the Thomson variety was something that had gained a real grip on the school system by the end of the 1930s³² and Paterson subsequently made similar claims for Thomson's role in Scotland³³ but as G. Sutherland (1984) has indicated, 'the reception of mental measurement was far more complex and much less tidy than they suggest'.³⁴ Thomson, indeed, was not the first Edinburgh University figure to service an English LEA in this respect. Sutherland notes that Bickersteth of the University Education Department had conducted tests for the East Riding before his arrival³⁵ and in Scotland not only Thomson but Boyd,

McClelland and Drever all encouraged the use of standardised tests. Even if initially this was largely seen as for diagnostic use in the individual classroom or on a national scale, as a way of discerning norms, none of them actually opposed the use of such tests in secondary schools or vocational selection. Indeed, as we have seen, Boyd recommended the Scottish procedures in America.³⁶ Thomson and his Moray House Service, on the other hand, apparently did little pre-war evangelism on the use of tests for selection among the Scottish authorities themselves. Indeed, according to Sutherland, he 'was not, did not choose to be a publicist',³⁷ and ten years after his arrival in Edinburgh and despite the widespread knowledge of his Northumberland testing procedures, the International Institute Examination Enquiry found that objective achievement and intelligence tests were in obligatory use by only two Scottish authorities as part of their qualifying procedures and those two, Wigtown and Bute, were amongst the smallest and least influential. In two larger ones, Ayrshire and Lanarkshire they were optionally available to solve particular selection problems, while in Fife, which did not operate a qualifying examination as such, they were used in connection with 'promotion to all advanced division courses' but even then with the major exception of what must have been the large number of students following literary and commercial courses.³⁸ The fact that four of the five users were in the west suggests as strong an influence from Boyd and his EIS research committee as from Thomson. Testing seems to have been completely absent from all four cities and many large counties such as Aberdeenshire and Dunbartonshire where a protégée of Thomson was the psychological adviser. Anything resembling the Scottish post-war 12+ examination was clearly absent while a number of authorities did not operate any qualifying examination, even of a conventional kind. Post-war style mass testing for selection was absent from most of Scotland, therefore, in the way that Sutherland has noted it was absent from such major English authorities as the London County Council, Bristol, Sheffield, Hull and Middlesex,³⁹ areas where the presence of Boyd and Thomson disciples was not unknown by this time.⁴⁰

Most of these had found posts in the newly created child guidance clinics and school psychological service and their influence in those fields in the pre-war period was far greater than any Scottish-based group testing movement and both Drever and Boyd were anxious to make a distinction between mental testing as a career and full psychology.⁴¹ Almost a quarter of all graduates were to spend their *longest* post-graduate professional life in such activity and in all parts of the United Kingdom, but not necessarily as organisers or even as approvers of group testing for selection purposes.

The role played by Scottish graduates in the local authority psychology field is now increasingly acknowledged, notably by Hearnshaw⁴² and by the key report of Summerfield (1968) which was to reshape the whole structure of the English and Welsh educational psychologists' profession, particularly in the local authority sector. Most telling of all perhaps was a British Psychological Society report of 1962, in which an improvement in the services to provide one educational psychologist per 10,000 children was recommended in the light of the fact that the Scottish ratio was now 1:8,000.⁴³

The fifty years of the degree's history saw not only the birth but a considerable development of the local authority psychology service throughout Britain with Glasgow graduates playing a particularly significant role. In Scotland, by 1952, 7 of the 11 principal educational psychologists appointed by that time were Glasgow EdBs while, among BQ respondents, Glasgow provided 53 long-term recruits to the service compared with Edinburgh's 23, a number not much greater than Aberdeen's 17 (table 17). Certainly the impression of Lumsden HMI who presided over the early English developments, was that Glasgow's contribution was greater than that of all the other Scottish universities put together,⁴⁴ and although the raw numbers involved seem small, they have to be seen against the background of a pre-Summerfield service which was far from labour-intensive. Many even of the largest authorities in England employed no more than one psychologist who dealt only with the most serious cases.

Twelve authorities, even in the late 60s, had no educational psychological service of any kind while, according to Summerfield, only 57% had filled their establishment.⁴⁵ In Scotland even as late as BQ a quarter of the authorities had none and the smaller counties were content to use the services of larger neighbours.⁴⁶

In England, some authorities did not even demand that their psychologists should have the education-related training of the type provided by the Scottish degree and as recently as BQ according to a Moray House sales representative's report, one outer London borough with a population of a quarter of a million people employed a part-timer who preferred 'chatting with the children over a cup of tea' to the use of 'inhuman' objective testing and such a situation was hardly surprising given that in 1956 the five recognised training centres in England provided only about 18 places per year for the provision of practical post-graduate training.⁴⁷

At the same time a long battle went on in many authorities over whether the (usually sole) educational psychologist should come under the jurisdiction of the director of education or of the medical officer of health.⁴⁸ As was noted earlier, this problem was compounded by the willingness of Thomson, as the leading test constructor, to countenance medical control of test administration on what was apparently a by no means restricted scale and to organise, with Drever, courses on mental testing for the large Edinburgh medical school, where many English medical officers received their training.⁴⁹ Significantly, perhaps, it was in the West of Scotland - in Dunbartonshire - that Burden, as Director, first established the right of a 'psychological adviser' (Paterson, an Edinburgh BEd) and not the medical service to 'spot mentally handicapped children'⁵⁰ while Dove (a Glasgow EdB) based her claim to have been the first LEA educational psychologist occupying a permanent post on the fact that her duties were clearly established 'beyond the reach of the medical officer'.⁵¹ Elsewhere, according to Lumsden, psychologists continued to be largely used merely for the settling of disputes among the doctors themselves, though, as he also indicates, the Birmingham appointment (in 1927) was not so much the first as the

first *successful* one, following what he regarded as the *debacle* of Burt's appointment to the LCC.⁵² Much of the difficulty, Lumsden felt, arose from a confusion of the medical officer's general duties to the community with his specific tasks as *school* medical officer, though as Sutherland had indicated, appointments to the medical staff in the '30s also attracted a greater central government grant than did the appointment of teacher/psychologists of the Scottish type. Psychologists on the medical staff attracted a support grant of 50% while appointments to the education staff attracted only 20%.⁵³

The administrative dispute with the doctors also reflected, however, a long debate in Scotland over whether a primarily educational or a quasi-medical approach was actually more desirable in the clinical treatment of children's problems, at least in the first instance. It also reflected a continued medical mistrust in England even of Boyd's largely innocuous use of testing. According to Keir, such opposition stemmed not so much from scientific mistrust as from the fact that they were being administered by laymen.⁵⁴ EdBs moving south were often amazed by the ideological antagonism to Boyd's apparently progressive use of tests on the part of some English teachers and found the medical officers far more welcoming, while a Thomson Research Fund file on Thomson's consultations with Darlington, cited by Sutherland,⁵⁵ contained the comment that 'the psychologist now appears not as the sorcerer but as the sorcerer's apprentice and an apprentice seemingly more welcome to the doctor than to the teacher'.

In Scotland, by 1942, the situation seems to have been largely resolved for in that year a minute of the executive of the Association of Directors affirms that only the 'mentally defective' were to be referred to medical staff⁵⁶ and the way was opened for a much wider development of the education authority child guidance services than had hitherto taken place, the Edinburgh service, for example, being set up in that same year. Inglis indeed suggested to BQ that the Scottish Child Guidance Council actually worked out a formal pact between the two sides with a prominent role being played

by Drever.

In England, however, the battle continued for some time and was still raging in some authorities in the 1960s. In Carlisle, for example, the services of the sole psychologist, a Glasgow EdB, were still being fought over by the Director and the MOH; and such battles reflected also the general national struggle over demarcation between the psychologists and the psychiatrists even outside the educational field. In this larger struggle, those teaching the education degree certainly knew where they stood. Despite the fact that Thomson and Drever did not share Boyd's openly acknowledged dislike of the medical profession's intrusion into these areas⁵⁷ (another reason, perhaps, for his failure to be given a chair), one Edinburgh respondent, later a professional psychologist, claimed to have left the course in the 30s without 'any knowledge of what a psychiatrist was'. Even in Scotland where the professional boundaries were more clearly defined, some local authority psychologists as late as the 1960s still felt that they were being directed away from conducting the individual, clinical treatment of problem cases in an extended, consultative way (in the tradition of the early Scottish clinics), towards an administrative role as organisers of mass group testing in connection with secondary selection, or towards the role of so-called 'Binet bashers', administering Stanford-Binet, WISC or other individual tests many times a day as a means of categorising problem children who were then passed on for psychiatric or classroom remedial treatment.

On the other hand, not all respondents had found their professional life as psychologists equally frustrating. Some felt that at the very least the course had given them a professional awareness as pioneers in a development that the ADE was describing, as late as 1949 as being "merely at its beginnings".⁵⁸ Moreover, those pioneers had in Thomson, Drever, Boyd, Rusk and Knight of Aberdeen patrons who could usually guarantee good appointments in this field, as they were created or became vacant. One of Thomson's proteges suggested that this was largely because, in pre-war days, there was not the same obligation in Scotland seriously to advertise

such appointments and the authorities, inexperienced in such fields, found it both easier and safer to approach whichever of the University Education Departments was best known to them. Given the early shortage of such posts, patrons were even willing to fight for their own candidates against their Scottish colleagues.⁵⁹ Thus the appointment of Paterson to Dunbartonshire represented a "victory" for Edinburgh over an angered Boyd who had felt that the hinterland of Clydebank was his own fiefdom. According to Inglis Dunbartonshire was then seen as a "Thomson colony" in the middle of Glasgow territory⁶⁰ and in offering the Edinburgh newcomer help, Ann Macallister, Boyd's close clinic colleague, had to offer it quietly so as not to annoy him.⁶¹ He was openly proud of the fact that "gradually ... the counties round Glasgow came to be staffed by these students of mine".⁶²

Such local authority psychology posts proved particularly attractive to women, not merely for their own sake but also as an escape from the male dominated school career structure, in which, as one Aberdeen psychologist put it to BQ, she could 'look forward to forty years in which there might never once be any promotion' and although in actual numbers male psychologists in BQ outnumber females, so far as their longest job is concerned they form only 17% of all male graduates, whereas the women form 43.1% of their grouping (table 19).

A key factor in student commitment, especially in Glasgow, was the establishment of the university child guidance clinics by Boyd and Drever.⁶³ Indeed the decision to found the Glasgow clinic was taken at a meeting apparently convened by the EdB students themselves and the arrangements continued to be highly informal. Boyd describes how he discussed the plan with the current Psychology Lecturer, Smith. "We had no information about how guidance was managed in America and even if we had it would not have helped ... We had only a pound or two between us."⁶⁴ He found teachers at first reluctant to cooperate because sending clients would involve a confession of failure. Nevertheless he rejoiced in the *ad hoc* approach of their early days, when they were supported by no real theory. Faced with a sleep-walking girl, for

example, he confessed his ignorance to the students. In the end he decided to give her an intelligence test and tell her to come back in a fortnight. The sleep-walking duly stopped. "I thus made one discovery:" he said, "that as soon as I became confident of my power to cure, the cures came ..." ⁶⁵ and with them came public confidence in his methods and his graduates. The clinic thus remained dominated by his own idiosyncratic style. Handing over to Rusk in 1946, Boyd noted, 'I have always been managing-director and have taken the initiative in making whatever changes were called for from time to time. There has only been one meeting in recent years attended by Vernon (or was it Thouless?)'. ⁶⁶ It also, as a result, remained very clearly in the hands of the Education rather than the Psychology department and as its letterhead made clear, cases could be referred just as readily by parents as by teachers.

Even when, on Rusk's recommendation, Boyd's clinic ceased to provide competition for the new city clinics, it still remained for a time an informal research centre much used by EdB students. Throughout its history it emphasised Boyd's view that educational methods for dealing with problems should be tried first before medical solutions were resorted to though they did, he admits, occasionally use friendly psychiatrists. ⁶⁷ As Paterson put it, 'English educational psychology wanted, in the American style, to adjust the maladjusted, the Scottish wanted to bring forward the backward'. ⁶⁸

According to Inglis, Boyd used his large MA class (over 100 in the 30s) as a link between the Clinic and the future teaching profession and he made sure that the Clinic staff was also not averse to discussing parents' general family problems concerning illness, death, the coming of siblings etc. and he himself insisted that despite his furtherance of the teacher-psychologist idea, the Clinic was not just interested in educational problems. ⁶⁹

The Boyd clinic opened in 1926, yet it was not until 1938 that any similar clinic

was provided with premises by an education authority on a full and permanent basis and even that clinic, in Ayrshire, had been created under the auspices of Boyd and the New Education Fellowship and did not become an official county service until 1941,⁷⁰ while in connection with Boyd's relief work for the unemployed, he and Ann Macallister had opened further smaller clinics, for example in a disused shop in Clydebank, where the county authority was dragging its feet over such matters.⁷¹

Glasgow city, though it had apparently 'established' a clinic in 1937, did not staff it fully until 1942 though the accounts of its history are confusing. Such confusion arises, according to McCallum (1952) from the fact, "typical of Scotland", that although the 1937 service was "allocated" a full-time psychologist by Glasgow EA in that year (plus two part-time psychiatrists from the Public Health Department) the psychologist was not officially "appointed" until 1942 and the psychiatrists' appointments were not "confirmed" until 1945. Dell indicates that, by 1962, Glasgow had 16 Clinics.⁷² Certainly, by the outbreak of war the West of Scotland, and indeed Scotland in general, were still largely dependent on the clinics established in the universities and colleges and largely staffed by BEd/EdBs, though the other significant Glasgow Institution, the Clinic in Notre Dame College, appears to have been much more medical in its orientation,⁷³ being endowed with the American money so mistrusted by Boyd. Even so, despite its psychiatric assumptions, it was headed by a teacher-psychologist, Sister Mary Hall.⁷⁴

The Drever clinic, though also dating from the mid-twenties and also largely staffed with education graduates and students, differed fundamentally in its approach from the one in Glasgow University. Boyd had always aimed at building up a professional body that were teachers first and psychologists second and such an approach continued to have the support of Vernon, who, even as late as the time of Summerfield repeated his view that teachers turned psychologist made better educational psychologists than young graduates in psychology with no teaching experience and no knowledge of general educational theory. Their comparative

ignorance of general psychology was to him less important. By 1945, he claimed, approximately 10% of the Service psychologists who had posts of major responsibility were ex-teachers and he was all the more impressed by the professional usefulness of the EdB because students who took the MA (Hons) in Psychology so rarely became professional psychologists.⁷⁵

Drever's clinic had begun its life not with a general remit but with a special interest in delinquency.⁷⁶ Indeed, it had been backed by the Howard League for Penal Reform and it continued to reflect its founder's research interests and socially instrumental view of educational psychology, often seeing solutions to problems in social, rather than individual, personal development terms. Even so, his students were not immune to the Boyd emphasis, given that they all were experienced teachers and had a wide knowledge of educational issues. According to Inglis, the only real difference from Glasgow lay, ironically, in the fact that Drever workers did most of their work in the "adjustment" classes of schools whereas Boyd's operated in the University Clinic or in other local non-school-based centres. Thus in their later work they seem to have had more in common with their Glasgow colleagues than with the non-teacher products of the new English training centres and Boyd claimed of Scotland as a whole in a 1935 article 'that in no other country of the world, not even in America, (was) there such a considerable group of teachers combining a high degree of teaching skill with a comprehensive scientific training'.⁷⁷ The popularity of Glasgow graduates in particular, alongside the compliments to the Scottish courses paid by Summerfield, suggest that Boyd and his Psychology colleagues had hit on a successful formula that helped to shape the new service in all parts of Britain. This is a particularly noteworthy fact given that the primacy awarded in Scotland to educational issues ran directly counter to the declared views of such an apparently influential figure as Burt, who, in his review of Summerfield, expressed the view that 'the chief emphasis should ... be on the practice of psychology rather than on the practice of teaching' and felt that experience in a secondary school was 'hardly

relevant'.⁷⁸

This Anglo-Scottish difference of emphasis was highlighted in a Scottish report of 1964 which noted that not only were all the Scottish clinics staffed by a ready supply of psychologists who were also trained teachers but that no Scottish clinic currently employed psychiatrists at all. It went on to recommend that there was no 'justification for departing from the general arrangements operating in Scotland which produce such good general relationships'.⁷⁹ These arrangements were further reinforced by the fact that the local authority psychologists' pay scales in Scotland formed an integral part of those of the teachers.⁸⁰

Curr (himself an EdB) reviewing Summerfield noted that unless the output of child guidance workers could be raised in England, as it had been in Scotland, the logical course of action was to attract 'a body of teachers who have studied the psychology of education beyond the level attempted in their initial teacher-training'. It was, he felt, useless to rely on the conversion of psychology graduates to educational interests. Only 1 in 7 of British undergraduates studying psychology had expressed an interest in Child Guidance as a career, whereas the corresponding figure for psychology specialists in the Scottish education degree was 1 in 2.⁸¹

Summerfield itself took only limited evidence in Scotland (with that of Drever *filis* being the only Scottish-based name appearing in the final report). Even so, the committee had no hesitation in calling for the continued recognition of the Scottish degree (albeit in a more specialist form) as a full professional training, and actually called for more generous grants to be made to full-time Scottish students,⁸² at a time when Drever, having persuaded Pilley to double the length of the Edinburgh course in order to ensure continued recognition, was now feeling the draught of student desertion.⁸³ Ironically, Summerfield did not call for the lengthening of the course elsewhere.

3. The degree and teacher-training

In his review of Summerfield, Curr also noted a continuing tendency of educational psychologists to leave the service and suggested that, in his opinion, at least a third of them became college or university lecturers in education or psychology.⁸⁴ Table 19, relating longest job to last job suggests that this was true of only some 12% of seriously committed BQ respondents, but this lower figure is perhaps explained by the fact that so many BEd/EdBs had already found a direct path into such posts at an earlier stage of their career than might be normal in England. As table 15a shows, of those joining the course with a psychology career in mind 36.4% ended their careers as university or college teachers or as high level research workers and from table 17 it is clear that these job categories provided 29.8% of all graduates with their longest employment,⁸⁵ a proportion only 0.2% less than school and further education teaching.

In fact, College and University work scored more highly than the latter in raw numbers in each of the decades except the 1950s, and among females, full-timers and Edinburgh graduates of whatever period. In Glasgow, it is a mere 1.4% behind school-teaching as the longest job and only in Aberdeen are the school-teachers clearly in a majority. In the table dealing with graduates' last jobs (table 18), College and University teaching takes the lead over every other occupation except marginally in the case of those who graduated in the 1940s when many new and permanent psychology posts were created, as well as very strikingly in the case of females, 43.1% of whom ended up as psychologists outside the higher education sector. On the whole, therefore, it was a very popular destination for graduates.

It is not difficult to see why the degree should make such an impact on the Scottish Colleges. The preponderance of graduates among the college students of the inter-war years before the non-graduate certificate classes were enlarged⁸⁶ meant that some form of higher degree was thought increasingly appropriate for staffs otherwise no better qualified than the students themselves. The Bachelor of

Education was more rapidly and cheaply acquired than any other suitable degree available in Scotland, as well as providing appropriate training. Moreover, by demanding both higher study and teaching experience it provided an ideal formula for ensuring that staff members were both in touch with recent academic ideas and not out of touch with the classroom or clinic. Its curriculum touched on most of the areas of training likely to be demanded by government regulations, while holders of such a relatively low status degree were unlikely to demand the high salaries that an American-style faculty of PhDs might well have demanded.

The BEd/EdB graduates' research ambitions were not usually great enough to demand an expensive, supportive infrastructure though their appetite for research had sometimes been sufficiently whetted for them to want to undertake work for outside bodies such as SCRE and the local authorities who would themselves cover most of the necessary expenses. College work, during the Thomson period of dual control in Edinburgh, was sometimes seen as a way of providing a temporary living for promising students, many of whom became short-term lecturers in the College or teachers in the College School before moving on to more significant appointments; and this goes some way to explain the greater incidence of successfully completed doctorates among pre-1950 Edinburgh graduates (table 14). It was certainly an easy process both there and in St. Andrews for a Professor who was also head of a College to translate successful students from one institution to the other though it seems to have been common also in Glasgow and Aberdeen, where there was much interchange of staff between the two institutions.

It is even easier to see why the Scottish graduates made their way into the English training field though this success was particularly striking, given the recession of the 20s and 30s.⁸⁷ Fred Clarke, writing in 1943, welcomed a new English interest in research 'carried out under scientific controls' but in doing so simply drew attention to the way in which England had fallen behind, still without a research body 15 years after the founding of SCRE and often still sceptical about the need to create one. In

most university departments, he felt, research still had 'the nature of a sideshow'⁸⁸ and in most colleges it was virtually unknown. As a result, Scottish candidates for English lecturing posts were able to point to an already acquired scientific expertise, particularly in fields such as testing and experimental education, that English candidates for such posts were unlikely to possess, as well as to a generalist higher qualification in Philosophy, History and Theory that was virtually unknown in England in the pre-war period. Moreover they could often offer in addition many years of teaching experience, usually the only qualification offered by English candidates, while at professorial level Scottish education graduates like Oliver in Manchester and Morris in Bristol introduced a modern polymath approach to Educational Studies that was becoming rarer among professors south of the Border, a polymath approach that Thomson himself had had to make some effort to develop in Edinburgh. Their arrival not only gave a great boost to the development of higher degrees in departments hitherto dominated by secondary training (as did the arrival of Seth and Nisbet in Belfast) but endowed some of these new degrees with Scottish elements, including an interest in primary as well as secondary schools.

In the English college sector, the path to success was easiest of all. Not only was the Scottish graduates' education degree of value in itself but the mere possession of *any* degree often lifted them above the crowd of applicants. As late as 1962, according to Shaw,⁸⁹ only 44.5% of female staff in English LEA colleges had university degrees and this actually represented a drop since 1954 of 0.7%, and while it was true that in the same year 73.5% of male staff in such colleges were graduates, because of the preponderance of women on the staff of such colleges, university educated teachers still formed a minority in the sector taken as a whole. Thus applications from candidates with two degrees,⁹⁰ including honours in psychology, sometimes with a knowledge of teaching young children, as well as basic expertise in all the main fields of educational study, were likely to be considered favourably, unless they frightened local councillors by looking potentially too expensive or too "faddist".

Taylor suggests that one of the reasons why English teacher education so often retreated from a multidisciplinary approach was because "tutors themselves ... often lacked the necessary qualifications that would enable them to teach the component strands of the Education course to a high level". Clearly the generalist nature of the Scottish degree overcame much of that problem.⁹¹

A College Principal who had spent her career in English training colleges informed BQ that few of her fellow Principals, let alone her staff, could claim anything equivalent to her EdB and often the same could have been claimed by Scottish BEd/EdB pre-war lecturers and professors operating in English, Welsh and Irish universities.

Ironically, since the foundation of the degree, it has been held by only a minority of education professors in Scotland itself. The sole Bell professor to do so was the first, male Edinburgh graduate, McClelland himself, and only the Nisbets, in Glasgow and Aberdeen, and Duthie in Stirling held chairs at the time of BQ. Since then Grant has succeeded to the Glasgow chair, but even in the Scottish colleges, the degree has never been seen as an essential qualification for a Principalship, though three out of the last four Principals of Moray House have held the degree as well as the present head of Jordanhill and a number of heads of other colleges. Graduates have however been numerous on the staffs of those colleges as well as on the staff of both the Psychology and Education Departments of the universities and it is by way of such people that the degree has possibly had its greatest influence on the Scottish teaching profession as a whole.

4. The degree in perspective

The success of degree-holders in administration, psychology and teacher-training, though certainly striking, should not however lead to an exaggeration of the degree's position in those professions as a whole. Even in Scotland, there have always been more administrators without the degree than with it as well as very many college

lecturers appointed on the basis of quite other expertise and while the BEd/EdB has tended to dominate the field of local authority psychology, that is probably more because it provided a quick path into the profession than because experience of the Scottish generalist education degree was always considered essential or even the most desirable path of entry. Teaching experience plus a normal psychology degree has been equally acceptable. Indeed, except in the case of the psychologists, there can never be any proof that particular people would not have got the post purely on the basis of their personal qualities or their other academic qualifications and life experience.

Certainly it was never a *sine qua non* of appointment to *any* post in the way that Scotland claims in his *History of Scottish Education*⁹² and although Zilversmit can speak of American "teachers of teachers" being "forced in the 1930s to go to graduate school and get higher degrees"⁹³ many of the most distinguished Scottish educationists of the last sixty years have not only never taken this degree but have not even been Diploma holders of the universities concerned.

On the other hand, for the Education departments and, in earlier times, also for the Psychology departments of those universities, the degree has been of crucial importance, giving them a solid purpose and influence that they never enjoyed before its introduction, as well as a base for further higher degree work and research programmes. It has enabled them to reap actual advantages out of the at first daunting refusal of government to allow them to provide initial training for teachers. Instead of their small staffs being weighed down by the task of training often unwilling secondary teachers, they found themselves dealing instead with a student body who were entirely volunteers, exceptionally enthusiastic about the task in hand and often making considerable personal sacrifices simply to be there. They could thus provide a stimulus to educational study, reflection and research throughout Scotland in a way that was never possible until recent years for the more hard-pressed Education Departments in the English universities. Indeed they were even able to

provide a stimulus of a more limited kind for those countries outwith Scotland that either employed their graduates or sent them their post-graduate students, particularly in the Psychology field.

Indeed, as the survey of the specialist professions has shown, the degree's impact can never be properly assessed within Scotland alone, and although its founders probably thought of it primarily as serving Scottish ends, the considerable increase in overseas students arriving in Scotland, and especially Edinburgh, during the 1920s, soon made it clear that there would be a wider demand, while the major post-war influx from England once the ex-service grants of the 40s and the universal student grants of the 50s became available, made it more certain.

As table 5 indicates, a third of Edinburgh respondents (and in view of the comparative difficulty of obtaining up-to-date non-Scottish addresses this may be one of BQ's underestimates) had taken their first degree outwith Scotland and most of them were to leave Scotland once the degree course was over. In addition, of course, many Scottish graduates also emigrated 'in accordance' as Nisbet points out, 'with a custom dating back over centuries'.⁹⁴ Indeed, the Scottish educationist became perhaps as familiar a figure in England, though not perhaps on the same scale, as the Scottish doctor of ship's engineer.

Thus in order to estimate the impact that the degree may have had on Scotland itself it is useful to estimate, however crudely, what proportion of graduate working time was subsequently spent there, as opposed to other parts of the world. Table 24 attempts to do this. As might be expected, Edinburgh and St. Andrews, attracting the highest proportion of non-Scottish students, provide the lowest proportion of working years in Scotland and the highest spent elsewhere in the world, while Glasgow, recruiting almost entirely from among its own graduates, provides the highest, some 3,482 years as opposed to Edinburgh's 2,318. On the other hand, of the years worked by those obtaining the degree in Glasgow, only some 78% were spent in Scotland

Table 24

Years worked by graduates after B.Ed./Ed.B. graduation according to location.

	Total years worked	Percentage of total years worked in						
		Scotland	England & Wales	N.Ireland	United Kingdom	Rest of Europe	Rest of World	Outside United Kingdom
Belfast	439.5	8.9	27.8	53.8	90.5	1.5	8.0	9.5
Aberdeen	936	65.4	24.8	5.0	95.2	0.6	4.2	4.8
Edinburgh	2318.5	52.3	27.7	2.4	82.4	3.8	13.8	17.6
Glasgow	3482.5	77.9	14.5	0.6	93.0	0.6	6.4	7.0
St Andrews	414	53.7	33.6		87.3	3.7	9.0	12.7
Total	7590.5	63.2	21.6	4.7	89.5	1.85	8.65	10.5

reflecting, perhaps, the great influx of Glasgow psychologists into England.

Of the non-British students, at least one became a university vice-chancellor and certainly a number held chairs or achieved other distinctions, and all of those who could be contacted by BQ and therefore by definition had kept in touch with their Scottish university, not surprisingly spoke approvingly of their experience there. On the other hand, BQ, of course, had no information on those overseas students who had died, could not be contacted or chose not to reply at such a distance as well as on those overseas candidates who may not have satisfactorily completed the course. It is therefore impossible to gauge satisfactorily the extent of the usefulness of the course to non-British students, let alone its impact on their educational systems.

Nor are some of the degree's effects in Scotland itself easily measured by a mere addition of the years worked in Scottish posts. For example its existence presumably enriched the general discussion of Scottish education by its wide diffusion of modern ideas and foreign models as well as by its encouragement of research and reorganisation. It certainly gave birth, for example, to Scotland's first academic journal in the educational field, *Scottish Educational Studies*, which was initially launched by the Glasgow Education Department on behalf of the others, in order to facilitate the publication of those BEd/EdB research findings that might not easily have found their way into non-Scottish journals. But such a development merely followed similar moves in a number of English departments and its publication had so little impact that it faced continual financial crises leading to its eventual take-over and renaming as *Scottish Educational Review* by the non-university body, the Scottish Educational Research Association. Certainly it was less widely read by teachers and presumably education graduates than was its contemporary *Education in the North* published by Aberdeen College of Education.

Perhaps the uniqueness and extremely small circulation of *Scottish Educational Studies* puts the significance of the Scottish degree into perspective when compared

with the explosion of learned journal publishing (much of it lastingly successful) that accompanied the founding of the American and Canadian higher degrees in the same subject areas.

To the EIS leaders who campaigned for such a degree to set as a professional badge upon the most dedicated members of their profession, it must have seemed something of a disappointment. While it undoubtedly brought new ideas to the system, it never became that symbol of professional respectability for which they hoped. In fact instead of becoming a central qualification for the whole profession, or even the badge of a professional elite, it became mainly the preserve of the unmarried, the late marrying or otherwise childless males in a profession not noted either for its exceptional celibacy or maleness. In the post-1945 years, a General Teaching Council and teacher registration, always popular ideas in England and greatly favoured by Laurie and his Teachers Guild, seemed to hold far more professional promise than any further involvement with university higher degrees.

For government in Scotland the degree provided in one sense a welcome and cheap source of specialists at a time when the government's own colleges and the other sectors of higher education were not able to supply them. Thus it was willing, in the post-war period, by making grants available to candidates, to underpin college staffing, research and the psychology service, especially as it was the UGC and not the SED that had thus to pay below-the-line costs, but the future of the Degree was hardly ever even a marginal consideration in their educational forward-planning. Even in McClelland's own Advisory Council Reports of 1944-46, written in the degree's heyday, it receives little mention, and though it is still seen as a desirable qualification for "posts outside teaching" it is suggested that its future effectiveness will depend on students having more foreign experience.⁹⁵

In another sense, however, the degree always posed a threat to government. As Humes puts it, speaking of the later MEd, "(the degree) is not always appreciated by

administrators as it leads to teachers asking fundamental questions of a kind that often challenge prevailing orthodoxies,"⁹⁶ and the financial pressures on the Departments and the new degree during the 1970s and 80s demonstrated how even outside the teacher-training sphere, their effective existence ultimately depended on the tolerance of SED. In recent years government appears to have favoured a wider development of specialist training courses as well as much research within a college sector, which has also demanded and in some places been given a greater role in the teaching and control of the University Diploma.

The result has been a clear diminution of the University Departments' role and probably of their influence. One of the Bell chairs, in Dundee, has already disappeared, leaving only four of the eight universities with viable departments and there are already fears of what may happen the next time a chair becomes vacant, for in the Universities themselves, with the exception of new-style Stirling, allowed by SED to engage in teacher-training, the marginality of the University Education Departments remains apparent.

The degree never became the money-spinner for the Universities that it promised to become in 1917 and it dealt with its subject in a generalist way increasingly under suspicion in the wider international academic world of which the Scottish Universities were now far more consciously a part. University policy-making was increasingly dominated by the needs of the great international subject professions as well as by more and more pressures from the providers of funds in London, whose views naturally tended to be London views. Things were very different from the days when Scottish university policy could be decided in the Station Hotel, Perth where three Principals could spend a whole day, as they did in 1918, pondering the single issue of whether the Aberdeen education degree should be called Bachelor or Master.

The future for idiosyncratic Scottish degrees is now clearly unpromising. Edinburgh's Ordinary MA has been renamed BA in the English manner and the new

Master of Education degree though it has inherited some of its predecessor's generalism, has in it far more of the specialist approach to Educational Studies fashionable elsewhere. Whether it can retain its remaining generalism in face of competition from the specialist degrees to be increasingly taught at a distance in Scotland by London University and the Open University remains to be seen. It seems unlikely.

NOTES

1. Somewhat surprisingly, this Quaker admiration was noted by three respondents.
2. BQ interview with Paterson.
3. These new authorities were directly elected in the manner of the School Boards and were *not* identical, as in England and Wales, with the general County or County Borough authorities.
4. Clarke (1919) p 302 ff. See also *Proceedings of the Royal Philosophical Society of Glasgow* Session 1920-22 p 133 ff.
5. Larson (1977) p 183.
6. SED Circular No 1 (5 Apr 1919).
7. Walker (1970) p 105 quoting a Departmental minute (24 Oct 1922) "Faddists are numerous in the education authorities ... A few of the Executive Officers are of the same type, but by no means all or even many".
8. Walker (1970) p 105.
9. *Ibid.* p 104.
10. *Ibid.* p 103.
11. *Ibid.* pp 105.
12. *Alma Mater* 20 Jan 1909.
13. *Glasgow University Magazine* 3 Feb 1932.
14. *Journal of Education* Apr 1928.
15. ADE Conference Reports 1936.
16. *Ibid.* 1938.
17. *Ibid.* 1939.
18. In Wright and Snodgrass (1942).
19. ADE Conference Reports 1943.
20. *Ibid.* 1941.
21. *Ibid.* 1950.
22. *Ibid.* 1952.
23. BQ interviews with a number of his graduates, though in the special Scottish education of *New Era* (Jul-Aug 1935) pp 175-77 he agreed that "first credit" for the new life in Scottish education

- since 1918 must go to the Directors (cited by Wade (1939) p 135).
24. BQ interview with Reith, for whom he waived the full-time rule.
 25. Thomson (1931) p 433.
 26. Education Authorities Directory and Annual 1960.
 27. Walker (1970).
 28. Education Authorities Directory and Annual 1967.
 29. See, for example, Scotland (1969a) p 150. Nisbet (1962) p 27 refers to it as "a commonly held belief".
 30. Letter to BQ 30 Oct 1968. Rothes (1949) p 154 describes him, fresh from Glasgow as "young, ambitious, idealistic but with typical Scottish caution".
 31. McClelland (1942).
 32. See, for example, Banks (1955) p 129. "By the outbreak of war in 1939 the use of intelligence tests and standardised tests of English and Arithmetic ... had been adopted by almost every local authority ..."
 33. Paterson (1975).
 34. Sutherland (1984) p 254.
 35. Sutherland (1984) p 239. This was earlier in 1925 before Thomson's induction.
 36. See chapter 6 above.
 37. Sutherland (1984) p 218.
 38. Hartog (1937), though it is difficult to square this information with that supplied by McClelland to Wade (1939) in June 1935. He claimed that 12 authorities (out of 33) were using intelligence tests in that year. He does not, however, specify which and does not claim that this group use was mandatory in secondary selection procedures.
 39. Sutherland (1984) p 256.
 40. Zilversmit (1976) p 260 provides a reminder that ideas prevalent in teacher training can take a decade or more before they finally *permeate*, as opposed to *penetrate* the school system.
 41. See, for example, Drever *Scottish Educational Journal* 9 Nov 1934.
 42. Hearnshaw (1964)pp 268 ff.
 43. Cited by Burt (1969).
 44. In letter to BQ.

45. Summerfield p 13.
46. Maladjusted Report p 17.
47. Wall (1956) p 36. In the same paper (p 92) he pays especial tribute to the arrangement of the psychological services in Glasgow and Aberdeen though it must be admitted that one trained, Scottish psychologist in his response to BQ claimed that, on reflection, many of the so-called clinical cases he had to deal with required nothing but an old fashioned "big stick".
48. Sutherland (1984) p 96 notes that the Oxford Child Guidance Clinic employed no psychologist at all. See also Sutherland and Sharp (1980) *passim*.
49. Interestingly, this entrance of Psychology to the Medical Faculty, which still dominated student journalism in Edinburgh, led to the first appearance of reviews of psychological works alongside the medical text-books e.g. *Student* 14 May 1929.
50. BQ interview with Paterson.
51. Letter to BQ.
52. Letter to BQ. Sutherland would probably not accept the word *debacle* though Sutherland and Sharp (1980) p 188 do accept that "despite the fact that Burt was the psychologist most frequently consulted by the Board of Education in the inter-war years, his actual impact on practice in English schools then was almost certainly less than that of Godfrey Thomson through Moray House Tests". Lumsden makes a similar claim for the products of Boyd and Thomson in the English Psychological service. On p 194, however, Sutherland and Sharp rightly draw attention to the fact that Burt is cited in the British psychological literature far more commonly than Thomson - twice as often in the *British Journal of Psychology* between 1904 and 1941 - in relation to the application of reasoning tests.
53. Sutherland (1984) p 94.
54. Keir (1952) p 15. He does however discern the beginnings of a thaw round about the time the Scottish Education degree was established and believes that by 1930 medical acceptance of psychology was both more widespread and encouraged by government. Somewhat implausibly (p 22) he suggests that the victory of psychology in certain areas was the result of the high prestige of the teaching profession with which the former was by now inextricably linked.
55. Cited by Sutherland (1977).
56. ADE Executive 19 Jun 1942.
57. In particular he scorned the English (and Notre Dame, Glasgow) tendency to turn too readily to the psychiatrist (Boyd pp 289-90) though, ironically, in his autobiography he admits to feeling that he himself might have made a good psychiatrist (Boyd Autobiography p 157).

But he did not object to the English tendency merely for its own sake; in fact it had been induced by their acceptance of American money and thus American models. Ironically Burt, the chief enemy of his ideal teacher-psychologist, happened also to regard psychiatrists as the "least intelligent medicals" (Hearnshaw (1979) p 98) while Simpson suggests that the "American models" themselves later moved closer to Boyd's position (Simpson (1980) p 49). Fleming emphasised to BQ the dependence on American money that she had found among English medical clinics during the 20s.

58. ADE Executive 20 Jun 1949.
59. There were numerous references to widespread patronage in BQ responses and interviews.
60. BQ interview with Inglis.
61. BQ interview with MacAllister.
62. Boyd Autob p 250.
63. To be followed later by clinics in Dundee and Aberdeen, where it was founded by Walker on Glasgow lines (*Aberdeen University Review* Summer 1946). The Glasgow clinic, Sampson notes, was established a year before the psycho-analytically orientated East London Guidance Clinic, (Sampson (1980) p 15) and its appearance reflects a general national concern of the 20s. See, for example, the discussion of the provision of teachers for the backward and mentally retarded in the *Report of the Imperial Education Conference of 1923* Boyd in his Autobiography p 248 expresses some annoyance that the primacy of his clinic was not generally recognised in England.
64. Boyd Autob p 248.
65. *Ibid.* p 249.
66. Letter in Clinic Collection. Such vagueness bears out Inglis's view in *College Courant* Martinmas 1962 that Boyd never took committees seriously. On February 22nd 1926 he solemnly held a meeting of the Education Board of Studies, apparently, at which he was the only member present.
67. Boyd Autob p 389.
68. BQ interview with Paterson.
69. *Scottish Educational Journal* 8 Mar 1935. Dell (1969) p 36 notes that the misconception that the Clinic was interested merely in educational problems continued after the war because the term "re-education" was so often used as a general description of child guidance procedures.
70. McCallum (1952) discusses the arrangements at this period in some detail.

71. BQ interview with MacAllister.
72. Dell (1969) p 35.
73. It is difficult in view of this to accept too readily the claim in Cruickshank (1970) p 166 that the Notre Dame clinic was Rusk-inspired, except insofar he generally infused a scientific spirit into the world of Scottish teacher-training.
74. McCallum (1952) p 80.
75. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* Vol XX Nov 1950. He believed the Glasgow EdB's success was mainly due to (a) the useful selection of students (b) their maturity and life experience (preferring the part-time course for this reason to the Edinburgh full-time - despite "its higher standards") and (c) the bias of the course.
76. Murchison (1936) p 33-34.
77. *New Era* Aug 1935 p 177 ff.
78. *BPS Bulletin* Vol 22 No 74 Jan 1969. Some have seen in this review a clear move away from the respect Burt had accorded teachers thirty years earlier when he suggested that "just as doctors have themselves built up the science of medicine ... so teachers are now setting to work to build up a science of education..." Cited by Sutherland and Sharp (1980) p 190.
79. Maladjusted p 16.
80. Much is made of this by McCallum (1952).
81. Curr (1969) p 93.
82. Summerfield p 34. The report comments in detail on the financial difficulties being faced by Scottish and Northern Irish students compared with those in England and Wales.
83. See chapter 7 above.
84. Curr (1969) p 93.
85. Ogren (1953) p 151 notes how in all British universities, by 1950, an increasing number of serving teachers availed themselves of higher degrees in Education in order to qualify as lecturers.
86. See chapter 7 above.
87. Browne (1979) ch 3.
88. Clarke (1943) p 17.
89. Shaw (1963). See also Taylor.
90. Taylor (1965) p 52 claims that one quarter of men and under one tenth of women lecturers in English and Welsh Colleges of

Education at that time had higher degrees in education. In earlier decades it was almost certainly considerably less. Unfortunately no equivalent figures are available for Scotland though there is no doubt that the vast majority of lecturers there did have a first degree.

91. Taylor (1964) p 29.
92. Scotland (1969a) p 150.
93. Zilversmit (1976) p 260.
94. Nisbet (1962).
95. McClelland Report (1946) p 45.
96. Humes (1986) p 190.

APPENDIX A

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE OLD SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEGREE

This investigation (referred to in the text as BQ) was originally suggested by two events:

1. The fiftieth anniversary of the approval of the first ordinances for the setting up of post-graduate degrees in Education in the Scottish universities
2. the general decision to rename the degree "Master of Education" following the recommendation by Robbins that the old title should be used for the new undergraduate degree courses which his report proposed.

At the invitation of the Scottish Council for Research in Education, who gave the project some financial support, the present author undertook the task of examining the degree's nature and significance. He realised that, given that the vast majority of holders and teachers of the degree were still alive, it would present a useful opportunity not merely to take historical account of the degree and the events surrounding it but also to assess the nature of the students' and teachers' experiences both during and after the course, as described by themselves. In addition to the use of desk-based historical techniques, therefore, he decided with SCRE support, to carry out a limited number of visits to relevant figures and also to despatch a wide-ranging questionnaire to all those holders of the degree who were believed to be still alive and traceable (some 91.1%).

By 1920 all four of the Scottish universities then in existence had similar Bachelor of Education ordinances though no graduations took place at St. Andrews until 1950, while only 38 students had graduated at Aberdeen by that year. At Edinburgh and Glasgow, however, graduations were already well past the hundred mark (178 in both

cases) and clearly the pre-war history of the degree must therefore be mainly concerned with those two universities. In the two smaller universities the number of graduations rose after 1950 apparently to meet the demands of the post-war educational system, while in Belfast a degree of a very similar type, devised by professors of Education and Psychology who were both holders of the Edinburgh degree, also began to be offered in the early fifties and was, at the request of that university, included in the questionnaire survey, although the number of Belfast respondents was small, numbering only 43 (8.4% of the total response).

It was clear that any questionnaire to be used against such a complicated background could not fail to run into difficulties because of the heterogeneity of the population involved. It was meant to be completed by all traceable graduates of five universities over a period of fifty years and there was inevitable difficulty in framing rubrics which were equally suitable for questioning, say, a full-time Edinburgh woman graduate of 1918 and a part-time Aberdeen man of 1959. However, without such a synthesised enquiry form, many of the comparative qualities of the research would have been lost while the numbers answering a particular version might well have been so small as to make any comparison of the results meaningless.

Thus the investigator had throughout to regard the degree as a single phenomenon with a life of some fifty years - albeit with interesting variations at different times and in different places - and attempted to assess the reactions and explore the subsequent careers of what he had to regard as a unified student body. There can, of course, be many objections to this unitary approach. There are clearly strong arguments against treating such a heterogeneous collection of educational experiences, acquired under such a heterogeneous collection of regulations, aims and teachers as a single phenomenon. Nevertheless the literature contains many references to the "Scottish Education degree" as a single academic phenomenon and the evidence of the investigation suggests that on balance such a view is justified - if only because a single questionnaire did in the end serve reasonably well.

The analysis of the responses took place in the Faculty of Social Sciences Research Centre at Edinburgh University during 1969 at a time when that Centre still had not begun to employ electronic computers. It took place therefore within the constraints of mechanical card-sorting and because of the time that has elapsed it has not been possible to undertake a fresh analysis, though the desirability of making more sophisticated correlations is recognised.

The questionnaire

(See facsimile in Appendix B.)

In its final form (following a pilot exercise involving 50 of the traceable graduates) the questionnaire ran to thirteen pages, and was divided into nine sections:

1. Personal details.
2. Details of Diploma in Education and experience of teacher training.
3. Other academic qualifications.
4. Reasons for embarking on the course.
5. Personal difficulties while taking the course.
6. Relationship between the Education and Psychology sides of the course.
7. The relationship of the degree to research.
8. Personal reactions to the course.
9. Relationship of holding the degree to subsequent career.

The pilot exercise involved the circulation of a preliminary questionnaire to a sample of some fifty subjects, chosen from the four Scottish universities, balanced for sex and from all periods of the degree's history, and was carried out some six months before the main survey. The nature of this sample and the response rate are included in table A.

Table AA

Male/Female (excluding Belfast)
in percentages

		Male		Female		No Response in BQ
		Actual	BQ	Actual	BQ	
Aberdeen		75.0	74.7	25.0	17.7	7.6
Edinburgh	pre-1950	64.6	64.2	35.4	34.0	1.9
	post-1950	77.7	73.9	22.3	21.7	4.3
	total	69.4	69.7	30.6	27.1	3.3
Glasgow	pre-1950	59.8	62.5	40.2	31.7	5.8
	post-1950	75.6	68.1	24.4	23.0	8.8
	total	68.0	65.4	32.0	27.2	7.4
St Andrews		84.6	76.9	15.4	13.5	9.6
Total		72.6	68.6	27.4	24.0	7.4

The object of this pilot exercise was more to test the suitability of questions for all universities and all periods and to avoid verbal ambiguity than to seek reliable information from these particular individuals who were then lost to the general survey.

Anonymity

The decision to make the completion of the questionnaire anonymous was taken before the despatch of the pilot form because it was felt that this would lead to greater candour on the part of those who had been dissatisfied with certain aspects of the course but who might refrain from saying so if their name had to be attached.

In the event the decision seems to have been justified, partly because of the amount of critical material that did come to light (e.g. over the inadequacy of training in research) and partly because some respondents who were frank about their own identity, confirmed that they did not wish their name to be linked to their comments in the final report. This suggests that others might well have been deterred from making critical remarks if names had been demanded.

As a result of the anonymity rule, however, it was necessary to ask respondents to give their sex and 38 respondents (7.4%) in the main survey ignored this question. This was totally unexpected, as no-one had failed to respond to this question in the pilot exercise and this accounts for what might otherwise be the puzzling fact that in some tables male and female taken together total only 475 instead of the expected 513 i.e. the total number of respondents. There were similar failures to respond to other factual questions such as those on age, date of graduation etc. and this has consequently produced a number of variations in 'n' throughout the relevant tables. Even so, as table AA demonstrates, there is other evidence of an uneven representation of the sexes as between groupings, particularly in the case of Aberdeen.

The respondents

The initial population to be examined were all those who had ever *been awarded* the degree of Bachelor of Education at a Scottish University or at Queen's University, Belfast and who were thought to be still alive and traceable in 1968 when the investigation began.

It had been suggested that all those who had ever registered for the degree course should also be included: as the reactions of drop-outs and "failures" might well throw a rather different light on the course. This notion was however rejected on a number of practical grounds, the chief of these being the fact that some of the people concerned were by then relatively influential figures in the comparatively small world of Scottish education and the recognition by a university research project of their earlier academic misfortunes would not only have created considerable embarrassment but would hardly have produced an atmosphere in which balanced responses could reasonably be expected. For similar reasons, no socio-economic investigation of graduates' family background was attempted.

As for those who had succeeded in graduating, there appeared to be exceptionally good information on their whereabouts, not merely because the recent conversion of BEd/EdBs into MEds had caused the General Councils to make a special effort to correct their address lists but also because all four Departments of Education involved had normally made a special effort to keep in touch with as many graduates as possible. Edinburgh and Aberdeen all published regular address lists and in Glasgow there was an actual graduate association - the Educational Colloquium - which still held regular meetings.

Thus the investigator began his task with what was perhaps over-confidence in his ability to contact and to obtain a reply from the vast majority of graduates. He realised that some failure could be expected, as little more than an 80% response could reasonably be expected even from a population which has just graduated and

some failure of response was naturally expected from among the older graduates, many of whom, judging from interviews, were often sick or unlikely to have the persistence to complete so relatively complex a questionnaire.

In the event, however, the lists even of recent graduates turned out to be unreliable as the many envelopes returned unopened demonstrated, so that an overall response of no more than some 61-62% was achieved (table A), rising (in the main survey) to 88.2% in the case of St. Andrews graduates of the 1960s but dropping to 42.9% in the case of Edinburgh graduates from the earliest period (1918-29). The final overall scores, therefore, are, as might be expected, skewed in the direction of more recent graduates.

The overall Edinburgh response to the main survey was only 52.8%, reflecting perhaps the difficulties faced in a university with a high proportion of older graduates and a higher proportion of graduates from overseas. However, because of the anonymity rule it was not always possible to discover who individual non-respondents were and to categorise them accordingly. As a result, the initial intention of regarding the investigation as that of the whole population became less and less tenable.

Moreover it was also possible that one other significant group had deliberately excluded itself from the investigation i.e. those who looked back on this particular part of their life with disdain or distaste and who did not wish to be reminded of it. One highly distinguished academic who did respond went so far as to assert that the course's contents were "valueless, and its only value formal", and others with equally strong feelings might have been more reluctant to voice such opinions. Thus it may be that negative feelings by graduates *are* under-represented - particularly as the investigator was writing as a member of staff in one of the Departments which offered the degree and might therefore not have seemed an appropriate or sympathetic audience for the reception of too harsh a critique. Certainly a successful professor could respond more boldly than a teacher in early middle age who might

Table A

Rates of Response

	No of graduates	No known to be dead	No with no known address	No totally untraceable	Total in pilot survey	Total in main survey	Total approached	As percentage of whole	Response overall	As percentage of whole	As percentage of those approached	Response to main survey	As percentage of whole	As percentage of those approached in main survey
Aberdeen:														
1920-39	14	5	1	6	2	6	8	57.1	7	50	87.5	5	35.7	83.3
1940-49	24	2	2	4	2	18	20	83.3	15	62.5	75	13	54.2	72.2
1950-59	63	2	2	4	3	56	59	90.7	41	65.1	69.5	39	61.9	69.6
1960-65	34	0	0	0	1	33	34	100	24	70.6	70.6	22	64.7	66.6
Whole Period	135	9	5	14(%)	8	113	121	89.6	87	64.4	71.9	79	58.5	69.8
Edinburgh:														
1918-29	58	14	6	20	3	35	38	65.5	18	31	47.4	15	25.9	42.9
1930-39	60	5	3	8	3	49	52	86.7	25	41.7	48.1	23	38.3	46.9
1940-49	60	1	2	3	5	52	57	95	33	55	57.9	30	50	57.7
1950-59	78	1	0	1	3	74	77	98.7	44	56.4	57.1	41	52.6	55.4
1960-66	25	0	2	2	4	19	23	92	15	60	65.2	12	48	63.2
Whole Period	281	21	13	34(%)	18	229	247	87.9	135	48.0	54.7	121	43.1	52.8
Glasgow:														
1920-29	19	4	1	5	2	12	14	73.7	13	68.4	92.9	11	57.9	91.7
1930-39	62	7	4	11	3	48	51	82.3	34	54.8	66.7	32	51.6	66.7
1940-49	124	6	11	17	4	103	107	86.3	63	50.8	58.9	61	49.2	59.2
1950-59	144	0	5	5	5	134	139	96.5	77	53.5	55.4	73	50.7	54.5
1960-65	60	0	0	0	3	57	60	100	43	71.7	71.7	39	65	68.4
Whole Period	409	17	21	38	17	354	371	90.7	230	56.2	62	216	52.8	61
St Andrews:														
1950-59	41	0	0	0	2	39	41	100	24	58.5	58.5	22	53.7	56.4
1960-68	36	0	0	0	2	34	36	100	32	88.9	88.9	30	83.3	88.2
Whole Period	77	0	0	0	4	73	77	100	56	72.7	72.7	52	67.5	71.2
Belfast:														
1949-59	39	0	0	0	0	39	39	100	26	66.7	66.7	26	66.7	66.7
1960-66	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	100	16	64	64	16	64	64
Whole Period	64	0	0	0	0	64	64	100	42	65.6	65.6	42	65.6	65.6
All Universities:														
Pre-1909	213	35	15	50	13	150	163	76.5	97	45.5	59.5	86	40.4	57.3
1940-49	208	9	15	24	11	173	184	88.5	111	53.4	60.3	104	50	60.1
1950-59	365	3	7	10	13	342	363	96.7	212	58.1	60.1	201	55.1	58.8
Post-1960	180	0	2	2	10	168	178	98.9	130	72.2	73	119	66.1	70.8
Whole Period	966	47	39	86	47	833	880	91.1	550	56.9	62.5	513	53.1	61.2

still need to seek references from the investigator's own Department.

It is clear also that both the pre-1940 graduates and those who took the degree at a reasonably advanced age will also be under-represented, compared with those who graduated after 1950 and were relatively young.

There is always a risk for the historian of giving too much weight to readily available material which cannot be weighed against other material no longer accessible or irrevocably destroyed and an attempt was made to overcome this by presenting the pre-1950 findings at Edinburgh and Glasgow as separate items in the summary tables. A cut-off point earlier than 1950 tended to produce figures of unreasonable smallness, although some further distortion may thus have been produced by grouping the demobilised students of 1946-50 with what were possibly very different pre-war class members. On the other hand, 1950 roughly marked the emergence of a new generation of students with no war experience, whose background and prospects differed markedly from those of the earlier period. Moreover it also marked the end of the significant Boyd-Rusk period in Glasgow and the Thomson-Drever period in Edinburgh, a turning point in educational studies at the two largest universities, of great significance in the development of a degree heavily dependent on the personalities of those teaching it.

Even so, it cannot be claimed that, statistically speaking, the contents of the many tables provided in chapters 8 and 9 represent the results of either scientific sampling or a total survey of the graduate population. They are simply the sum total of the facts and opinions that one historian was able to collect. From them he can draw suggestions of the truth but he must treat them with the same caution that he treats other forms of incomplete evidence.

Table B provides a reference table to the main categories employed in the analysis, though it must be emphasised again that because of non-responses, the sum of categories does not always equal the whole body of respondents.

Table B *Summary Reference Table to Main Categories used, by Universities*

	Total	Aberdeen	Belfast	Edinburgh pre-1950	Edinburgh post-1950	Edinburgh	Glasgow pre-1950	Glasgow post-1950	Glasgow	St Andrews
Male	352 a68.6	59 a74.7 b16.8	26 a60.5 b 7.4	34 a64.2 b 9.7	51 a73.9 b14.5	85 a69.7 b24.1	65 a62.5 b18.5	77 a68.1 b21.9	142 a65.4 b40.3	40 a76.9 b11.4
Female	123 a24	14 a23.3 b11.4	10 a34 b 8.1	18 a21.7 b14.6	15 a21.7 b12.2	33 a27.1 b26.8	33 a31.7 b26.8	26 a23.0 b21.1	59 a27.2 b48.0	7 a13.5 b 5.7
Part-time	239 a46.6	37 a46.8 b15.5	2 a 4.7 b 0.8			6 a 4.9 b 2.5	82 a78.8 b34.3	99 a87.6 b41.4	181 a83.4 b75.7	13 a25.0 b 5.9
Full-time	269 a52.4	42 a53.2 b15.6	41 a95.3 b15.2			116 a95.1 b45.4	20 a10.6 b 7.4	11 a 9.7 b 4.2	31 a14.3 b11.5	39 a75.0 b14.7
1920s and 1930s	86 a16.8									
1940s	106 a20.7									
1950s	199 a38.8									
1960s	119 a23.2									
Total	513	79 b15.4	43 b 8.4	53 b10.3	69 b13.5	122 b23.8	104 b20.3	113 b22	217 b42.3	52 b10.1

a = % of vertical total; b = % of horizontal total; c = % of university total

n.b. The discrepancy between certain overall totals and the sum of component groupings is accounted for by non-responses to the anonymous questionnaire (see text).

APPENDIX B
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

An Investigation of the Old Bachelor of Education Degree

Personal details

1. MALE/FEMALE
2. (a) University at which Bachelor of Education degree was
awarded
- (b) In what year?
- (c) What was your age at that time?
3. How many years elapsed between your beginning the degree course.
(i.e. at the post-diploma level) and your eventual completion
of all the degree requirements (i.e. both written papers and
thesis)?

The Diploma

4. (a) University at which your Diploma in Education (or its equivalent was awarded
 (b) In what year?
 (c) How long did your Diploma course last?
5. (a) Have you undergone an official course of training as a teacher? YES / NO
 (b) If your answer to (a) is Yes, at what institution did you do this?
 (c) If your answer to (a) is Yes, were you concurrently studying for your Diploma in Education or its equivalent? YES / NO
 (d) If your answer to (c) is No, were you concurrently studying for some other qualification (give details) YES / NO

6. Can you remember when you decided to take the Bachelor of Education degree? YES / NO
 If so, was it BEFORE / DURING / AFTER the Diploma in Education course or its equivalent?
7. If you took your Diploma in Education, or its equivalent, outside Scotland (or, in the case of Belfast B.Ed.'s, outside Northern Ireland), why did you decide to take the Bachelor of Education course in Scotland (or Northern Ireland)?

Other Qualifications

8. (a) University at which you gained your first degree

(b) Name of that degree

(c) Year conferred

(d) Was this an Honours degree? YES / NO

(e) Was it in the field of ARTS / SCIENCE / MEDICINE /
THEOLOGY / MUSIC / LAW / SOCIAL SCIENCES / OTHER

Space for comment, if necessary

.....

(f) If it was an Honours degree, name the specialist subject(s)

.....

9. (a) Did you take any other degree(s) or diploma(s) IN ADDITION
to the ones dealt with in questions 4 and 8 BEFORE you

took the Bachelor of Education degree? YES / NO

(b) If so, give awarding UNIVERSITY(IES) or INSTITUTION(S),
Name of degree(s) or diploma(s), year(s) of award, subject(s)

of thesis, if any

.....

.....

10. (a) Have you taken any further degree(s) or diploma(s) SINCE you

took the Bachelor of Education degree? YES / NO

(b) If so, give awarding University(ies) or Institution(s), name
of degree(s) or diploma(s), year(s) of award, subject(s) of
thesis, if any.

.....

.....

.....

11. Details of other subsequent awards, etc. (e.g. decorations such as
O.B.E., honours such as F.E.I.S., offices held in learned bodies,
personal chairs, etc.)

.....

.....

REASONS FOR EMBARKING ON COURSE

12. It is difficult to analyse one's own motives in making some decision, particularly when that decision may have been made half a century ago; however, we should be grateful if you could attempt to recall which of the following you now feel were MAJOR elements in your decision to move on from the diploma to the Education degree stage. A MAJOR element in my decision was:-
 A desire to understand more fully the theoretical bases of education. YES / NO

The influence and encouragement of friends involved in the course or holding the degree. YES / NO

The desire to train for educational research. YES / NO

A desire to become a qualified psychologist. YES / NO

A desire to become a university or college teacher. YES / NO

A desire to become an educational administrator. YES / NO

A desire for improved status as a school teacher. YES / NO

If any major element in your decision is not adequately represented, describe it here.

.....

PERSONAL DIFFICULTIES

13. What type(s) of full time posts, if any, did you hold between taking your first degree and beginning your studies for the Bachelor of Education degree (i.e. at post-Diploma level)?

Type of post

No. of years

.....

.....

.....

14. (a) Did you do the Bachelor of Education course (i.e. at the post-Diploma stage) on a part-time basis? YES / NO

- (b) If your answer to (a) is YES, would you at the time have preferred to have done it on a full-time basis?

YES / NO / CAN'T REMEMBER

- (c) If your answer to (a) is NO, would you at the time have preferred to have done it on a part-time basis?

YES / NO / CAN'T REMEMBER

Space for comments, if any

.....

15. Did a year or more divide your completion of the written paper requirements from your completion of the thesis (if any)?

YES / NO / NO THESIS DEMANDED

If YES give details

.....

.....

16. If you were a part-time student,

- (a) What type of post(s) did you hold while studying for the Bachelor of Education degree (i.e. at post-diploma level)?

.....

.....

.....

16. (b) If you were a part-time student, did your employer regard you as a full-time worker? YES / NO

- (c) If the answer to (b) is YES, did he ever make deductions from your salary for any time which you took off in connection with the course?

YES / NO / NEVER TOOK TIME OFF

Comments, if any

.....

- (d) If the answer to (b) is YES, was there ever any difficulty in getting time off in connection with the course or examinations? YES / NO / NEVER GOT TIME OFF

Comments, if any

.....

17. If you were a full-time student for the degree at post-diploma level,

- (a) did you receive an official grant from any source? YES / NO
 If so, from what source(s)? e.g. local authority, Carnegie Trust, etc.

.....

- (b) How would you describe the time of the course in terms of financial strain?

VERY GREAT / MODERATE / NO STRAIN

18. Were you married when you began the post-diploma course? YES / NO

If NO, were you married by the time you completed the degree requirements? YES / NO

No. of children of school or pre-school age at beginning of post-diploma course.

No. of children of school or pre-school age by the time you completed the degree course.

19. During the period of the course, did you have to sacrifice worthwhile spare-time activities?

ON A LARGE SCALE / TO A MODERATE EXTENT / NOT AT ALL

Space for comment

.....

RELATIONSHIP OF EDUCATION AND PSYCHOLOGY

20. Were the psychology classes which you attended also attended by undergraduate students who were not following courses in education?

ALWAYS

ON MORE THAN HALF THE OCCASIONS

ON LESS THAN HALF THE OCCASIONS

NEVER

CAN'T REMEMBER

Space for comment:

.....

21. In later periods of the degree's history, it has been possible to specialise, formally, in either Psychology or Education. Did you so specialise?

NO

YES - IN EDUCATION

YES - IN PSYCHOLOGY

If the answer is YES, tick those of the following which were major reasons for your choice.

..... GREATER ATTRACTION OF SUBJECT MATTER

..... MORE ATTRACTIVE TEACHING

..... REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSED CAREER

..... GREATER PERSONAL CONFIDENCE IN DEALING WITH
SUBJECT MATTER.

If the answer is YES, have you since regretted your choice?

YES / NO / I HAVE MIXED FEELINGS

Space for comments

.....

.....

22. IF YOU DID NOT SPECIALISE:

(a) do you feel that a satisfactory balance was kept between
Education and Psychology? YES / NO

(b) If the answer to (a) is NO, in which direction was it
unduly weighted? EDUCATION / PSYCHOLOGY

Space for comment:

.....

23. Do you feel that the content of the Education course and the content of the Psychology course were sufficiently related to each other? YES / NO

Space for comment:

- (a) Which of the two did you find more difficult?

EDUCATION / PSYCHOLOGY / BOTH EQUALLY

- (b) Which of the two did you find more rewarding in terms of your own personal education?

EDUCATION / PSYCHOLOGY / BOTH EQUALLY

24. Are you a member of the British Psychological Society?

YES / NO

If so, give type of membership with details of distinctions or offices held:

.....

25. Do you feel that the concept of Psychology and Education as separate but equal partners in one degree course was on the whole a useful one?

YES / NO / NOT SURE

Space for comments

THE BACHELOR OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

26. (a) In what field did you do your thesis (if *any)? (There is no need to give the title but merely a general indication such as 'Comparative Education', 'Test Construction', etc.)

.....

- (b) Why did you choose the topic which you did (e.g. was it suggested by the professor?)

.....

.....

- (c) Has your thesis been published? ALL OF IT / SOME OF IT / NONE

- (d) Have you done later research in the same field? YES / NO
Space for comments:

.....

.....

If so, has any of this research been published? YES / NO

- (e) Have you done later research in other educational / psychological fields? YES / NO
If so, in which fields?

.....

.....

Has any of this work been published? YES / NO

- (f) Have you published any other educational or psychological work (e.g. text books, anthologies, tests, etc.)? YES / NO

Space for detailed comment:

.....

.....

.....

- (g) Do you feel that the course provided a good training in research methods? YES / NO / I HAVE MIXED FEELINGS

Space for comments.

.....

.....

.....

* A thesis was not always demanded by every university.

GENERAL REACTIONS TO THE COURSE

27. Can you remember if any of the various courses or areas of study
awoke an especial enthusiasm in you? YES / NO
If so, which?
.....
28. Can you remember if there was any course or area of study which you
found especially difficult? YES / NO
If so, which?
.....
29. Can you remember if there was any course or area of study that you
found particularly uncongenial even though it was not particularly
difficult? YES / NO
If so, which?
.....
30. Can you remember if there was any area of study that you now feel
was given undue emphasis? YES / NO
If so, which?
.....
31. Can you remember if there was any course or area of study that you
now feel could have been dispensed with altogether?
YES / NO
If so, which?
.....
32. Was there any area of study which you now feel should have been
included or given greater emphasis? YES / NO
If so, give details
.....

33. Do you now feel, on the whole, that the content of the course was too great for the time available? YES / NO

Space for comments:

.....

34. Space for any further comment on the course, including any special memories of your period as a student which you feel are of significance (please feel free to append an extra sheet, if necessary).

.....

.....

.....

.....

35. Summing up your present feelings, do you feel that, on the whole, taking the course was a worthwhile experience in itself, regardless of career considerations?

YES / NO / I HAVE MIXED FEELINGS

RELATIONSHIP OF DEGREE TO SUBSEQUENT CAREER

36. Did you change your career plans as a result of attending the course?

YES / NO / SLIGHTLY

If so was this primarily due to the influence of a university teacher?

YES / NO

Space for comments:

.....

.....

37. (a) If you were seeking a post at the end of the degree course,
did this prove difficult? YES/NO/SLIGHTLY/DOES NOT APPLY

Space for comments:

.....

- (b) If you had such a search, did holding the degree seem to be of
GREAT ADVANTAGE / SOME ADVANTAGE / NO ADVANTAGE

38. TYPES OF POST HELD SINCE TAKING DEGREE

in chronological order.

Type of Post (e.g. L.E.A. official, Primary teacher etc.)	Time in Years	Was this degree or its equivalent an ESSENTIAL/ RELEVANT/PARTIALLY RELEVANT /IRRELEVANT qualification for this type of post?
---	---------------------	--

[illegible]

39. Where the degree (or its equivalent) was an essential or a relevant qualification for any post, do you feel that it proved a satisfactory preparation? YES / NO / NOT SURE

Space for comments:

40. Do you have any comments on the reputation of the degree among your professional colleagues? Has this changed over the years?

.....

41. On the whole, would you say that the time spent in taking the degree has been worthwhile in terms of your subsequent career?

YES / NO / I HAVE MIXED FEELINGS

Space for comments:

42. Since taking the degree, how much of your working life has been spent

(TIME IN YEARS)

in	SCOTLAND
	ENGLAND
	WALES
	NORTHERN IRELAND
	REPUBLIC OF IRELAND
	other countries (specify)	

REFERENCES

I. PRINTED GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

(A) REPORTS OF ROYAL COMMISSIONS

Reports of the Royal Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Endowed Schools and Hospitals (Scotland) (1873-75) **ENDOWED SCHOOLS**

Report of the Royal Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Universities of Scotland (1878) **1878 UNIV COMM**

Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (1895) **BRYCE**

Report of the Royal Commission on University Education in Dundee (1952) **TEDDER**

(B) SCHEME UNDER AN ACT

Education Endowments (Scotland) Act 1882 Scheme for the Management of the Bell Residue Fund (10 Feb 1888)

(C) PARLIAMENTARY AND DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

England and Wales

Report of the Select Committee on the Teachers Registration and Organisation Bill (1890-91) **REGISTRATION**

Report of the Consultative Committee on Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity and their possible use in the public system of education (1924) **C C (1924)**

Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders **McNAIR**

Report of the Committee on Maladjusted Children (1955) **UNDERWOOD**

Report of the Committee on Higher Education (1962-63) **ROBBINS**

Psychologists in the Education Services: Report of a working party appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science **SUMMERFIELD**

ScotlandAnnual Reports

Committee of Council on Education in Scotland Annual Reports (1873-1907) **C C Report**

Annual Reports of the Scotch/Scottish Education Department (1908-46) **SED Report**

Education in Scotland (An Annual Report) 1947- **E in S**

Other Reports

Report of the House of Commons Committee on the Scottish Universities (1910) **UNIV 1910**

Teachers: Supply, Recruitment and Training in the Period immediately following the War (A Report of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland) (1944) **McCLELLAND 1944**

The Training of Teachers (A Report of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland) (1946) **McCLELLAND 1946**

Report of the Inquiry appointed in February 1949 to review and report on the organisation of university education in Dundee and its relationship with St. Andrews University (1949) **COOPER**

Measures to improve the supply of teachers in Scotland: an interim report of a special committee of the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland (1957) **A C 1957**

Ascertainment of Maladjusted Children: report of the working party appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland (1964) **MALADJUSTED**

II. UNPUBLISHED GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Documents in the Scottish Record Office relating to the work of the Committee on the Teaching Profession, presided over by Professor McClelland (ED 8/52 and 52A)

III. UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS (NON-GOVERNMENTAL)**(A) MINUTES AND BOOKS OF VARIOUS BODIES**

The Courts (C), Senates (Sen), Faculties of Arts (Fac of Arts) and General Councils (G C) of the Universities of

St. Andrews
Glasgow
Aberdeen
Edinburgh

(St A)
(Glas)
(Aber)
(Edin)

The Board of Studies, Education, University of Glasgow

The Executive of the National Committee for the Training of Teachers (Nat Comm)

The Provincial Committees for the Training of Teachers (P C) in St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh

The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland

The General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland

The Executive of the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADE)

The Executive of the British Psychological Society (BPS)

The Executive of the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS)

The Pedagogical Society, University of Glasgow

(B) CONFERENCE REPORTS

Association of Directors of Education in Scotland

Educational Institute of Scotland

(C) MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

Boyd Papers, University of Glasgow

Geddes Papers, National Library of Scotland

Thomson Research Fund Archive, University of Edinburgh

Papers relating to the University of Glasgow Child Guidance Clinic (Clinic Coll)

Work books and Registers of the Education Class, University of Edinburgh 1917-22

IV. PERIODICALS AND JOURNALS CONSULTED

ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY REVIEW

ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

ALMA MATER (Aberdeen)

ALUMNUS CHRONICLE (St. Andrews)

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL

BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY

BRITISH JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION

BRITISH JOURNAL OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN OF THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BULLETIN OF THE NORTHERN IRELAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

BULLETIN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CHILD STUDY

COLLEGE COURANT (Glasgow)

COLLEGE ECHOES (St. Andrews)

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

EASTERN DAILY PRESS (Norwich)

EDINBURGH REVIEW

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY BULLETIN

EDUCATIONAL NEWS

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW (London)

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW (New York)

EDUCATIONAL TIMES

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES DIRECTORY AND ANNUAL

EDUCATION FOR TEACHING

EDUCATION IN THE NORTH

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW

FRASER'S MAGAZINE

GLASGOW HERALD

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE

HIGHWAY

HISTORY OF SCIENCE

HISTORY OF UNIVERSITIES

HISTORY WORKSHOP JOURNAL

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION REVIEW

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION (SCOTTISH EDITION)

JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND HISTORY

JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL PEDAGOGY

MIND

MONTHLY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

MORAY HOUSE MAGAZINE

MUSEUM

NATURE

NEW DOMINIE

NEW ERA

NEW UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY

NINETEENTH CENTURY NOTES AND ABSTRACTS IN AMERICAN AND INTERNATIONAL
EDUCATION (Michigan)

OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

PAIDOLOGIST

POLITICAL QUARTERLY

PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

SALTIRE

SCHOOLMASTER

SCHOOL WORLD

SCOTS MAGAZINE

SCOTSMAN

SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL

SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL YEAR BOOK

SCOTTISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

SECONDARY SCHOOL JOURNAL

SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

STUDENT

TEACHERS GUILD QUARTERLY

TIMES

TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT

TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT (SCOTLAND)

TRAINING COLLEGE RECORD

TRANSACTIONS OF THE CAERNARVONSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

UNICORN REVIEW

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION BULLETIN

UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY

UNIVERSITIES REVIEW

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH GAZETTE

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH JOURNAL

UNIVERSITY REVIEW

WESTMINSTER REVIEW

YEARBOOK OF EDUCATION

V. BOOKS, ARTICLES AND THESES CITED, OR USED FOR REFERENCE

ADAMS John (1912) *Evolution of Educational Theory*. London.

ADAMS John (1922) *Modern Developments in Educational Practice*. London.

ADAMS John (1929) *Everyman's Psychology*. London.

ADAMS J.W.L. (1980) "Johann Friedrich Herbart: His contribution to educational thought and practice" in SMITH & HAMILTON *The Meritocratic Intellect*

ADAMSON J.W. (1904) *Our Defective System of Training Teachers*. London.

ADAMSON J.W. (1930) *English Education 1789-1902*. Cambridge.

ALEXANDER R.W.P. (1935) "Intelligence, Concrete and Abstract: A study in different traits" (BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY Monograph Supplement XIX).
Cambridge.

ALEXANDER R.W.P. (1940) *The Educational Needs of Democracy*. London.

ANDERSON R.D. (1983) *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland: schools and universities*. Oxford.

ARMYTAGE, W.H.G. (1948) "Lyon Playfair and Technical Education in Britain" in NATURE no.4098, May 15. London.

ARMYTAGE, W.H.G. (1955a) *Civic Universities*. London.

ARMYTAGE, W.H.G. (1955b) *The Role of an Education Department in a Modern University*. Inaugural Lecture, delivered December 8, 1954, Sheffield.

ARMYTAGE, W.H.G. (1969) *The German Influence on English Education*. London.

ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION IN SCOTLAND (1943) *Education in Scotland: proposals for reconstruction*. Edinburgh.

AVRICH P. (1980) *The Modern School Movement: anarchism and education in the United States*. Princeton.

BAILEY K.C. (1947) *A History of Trinity College, Dublin 1892-1945*. Dublin.

BAILYN Bernard (1963) "Education as a Discipline: some historical notes" in WALTON & KUETHE *The Discipline of Education*.

BAIN Alexander (1879a) *Education as a Science*. London.

BAIN Alexander (1879b) Second Presidential Address to the Society for the Development of the Science of Education.

BAIN Alexander (1904) *Autobiography*. London.

BAKER K. & SIKORA J. (1981) *The Schools and In-Service Teacher Education Evaluation Project 1978-1981*. Bristol.

BALFOUR Graham (1903) *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland*. Oxford.

BALLARD P.B. (1920) *Mental Tests*. London.

BALLARD P.B. (1923) *The New Examiner*. London.

BALLARD P.B. (1937) *Things I Cannot Forget*. London.

BANKS Olive (1955) *Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education*. London.

BANTOCK G.H. (1953) "The Education Diploma Course" in UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY Vol 7 No 4 August.

- BARTLETT F.C. *et al.* (1939) *The Study of Society: methods and problems*. London.
- BELFORD A.J. (1946) *Centenary Handbook of the Educational Institute of Scotland*.
Edinburgh.
- BELL R.E. (1965) *The Master of Arts Degree in England and Wales* (unpublished MEd thesis, Edinburgh University).
- BELL R.E. (1975) *Godfrey Thomson and Scottish Education*, unpublished paper read at the 1975 conference of the British Educational Research Association.
- BELL R.E. (1983) "The Education Departments in the Scottish Universities" in HUMES & PATERSON *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980*.
- BENSON A.C. (Ed) (1917) *Cambridge Essays on Education*. Cambridge.
- BERRY M. (1973) *Teacher Training Institutions in England and Wales: a bibliographical guide to their history*. London.
- BIBBY Cyril (1961) "The Universities and the Teachers Colleges" in UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY Vol 15 No 3 June.
- BLAKE G.R. (1918) *Scotland of the Scots*. London.
- BLEDSTEIN, B.J. (1976) *The Culture of Professionalism: the middle class and the development of Higher Education in America*. New York.
- BONE T.R. (1967) *Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939*. London.
- BORING E.G. (1950) *A History of Experimental Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs.
- BOYD W. (1921-69) *History of Western Education*. London.
- BOYD W. (1923) *The Part Played by the School in Social Betterment*. Manchester.
- BOYD W. (1924) *Measuring Devices in Composition, Spelling and Arithmetic*. London.

BOYD W. (Ed) (1930) *Towards a New Education* London.

BOYD W. (1933) *America in School and College* Edinburgh.

BOYD W. (Ed) (1936) *The Challenge of Leisure* London.

BOYD W. (1956) *Emile for Today* London.

BOYD W. & RAWSON W. (1965) *The Story of the New Education* London.

BRAMWELL A.B. & HUGHES H.M. (1894) *The Training of Teachers in the United States of America* London.

BREHAUT Willard (1973) "British Research in Education: some aspects of its development" in BUTCHER & PONT *Educational Research in Britain* 3

BROWN R. (Ed) (1973) *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change: papers in the sociology of education* London.

BROWN T. (1820) *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*.

BROWN William & THOMSON Godfrey (1925) *The Essentials of Mental Measurement* (3rd edition). Cambridge.

BROWNE Joan D. (1979) *Teachers of Teachers: a history of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education* London.

BROWNING Oscar (1881) *An Introduction to the History of Educational Theories* London.

BRUBACHER John S. (1947) *A History of the Problems of Education* New York.

BRUBACHER John S. & RUDY W. (1968) *Higher Education in Transition: a history of American colleges and universities 1636-1968* New York.

BRYCE R.J. (1828) *Sketch of a Plan for a System of National Education for Ireland*,

including Hints for the Improvement of Education in Scotland. London.

BRYCE R.J. (1852) *Practical Suggestions for Reforming the Educational Institutions of Scotland.* Edinburgh.

Testimonials of the Revd R.J. BRYCE, Honorary Principal of the Belfast Academy addressed to the Home Secretary (1875). Belfast.

BURGESS R.G. (1984) *The Research Process in Educational Settings: ten case studies* Lewes.

BURKE C.B. (1983) "The Expansion of American Higher Education" in JARAUSCH *The Transformation of Higher Learning*.

BURNET John (1917) *Higher Education and the War.* London.

BURNET John (1929) *Essays and Addresses* London.

BURNS J.H. & SUTHERLAND-GRAEME D. (1944) *Scottish University.* Edinburgh.

BURT Cyril (1969) "Psychologists in the Education Services" in the BULLETIN OF THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY Vol 22 No 74 January.

BUTCHER H.J. & PONT H.B. (1973) *Educational Research in Britain 3* London.

BUTLER R.A. (1968) *Responsibilities of Education.* London.

BUTTERFIELD Herbert (1962) *Universities and Education Today.* London.

BUTTS R.F. & CREMIN L.A. (1953) *A History of Education in American Culture* New York.

CALLAHAN Raymond E. (1962) *Education and the Cult of Efficiency.* Chicago.

CANT R.G. (1970) *The University of St. Andrews: a short history.* Edinburgh.

CARNEGIE TRUST FOR THE UNIVERSITIES OF SCOTLAND (1920) *19th Annual Report 1919-20*

CARRIGAN D. (1961) *The Catholic Teachers Colleges in the United Kingdom 1850-1960*. Washington.

CARR-SAUNDERS A.M. & WILSON P.A. (1933) *The Professions*. Oxford.

CHARLTON K., STEWART W.A.C. & PAFFARD M.K. (1960) "Students' Attitudes to Courses in Education" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol VIII No 2 May.

CLAPAREDE E. Trans. LOUCH M. & HOLMAN H. (1911) *Experimental Pedagogy and the Psychology of the Child*. London.

CLARKE F. (1943) *The Study of Education in England*. London.

CLARKE John (1904) *Short Studies in Education in Scotland*. London.

CLARKE John (1918) *The School and Other Educators*. London.

CLARKE John (Ed) (1919) *Problems of National Education by Twelve Scottish Educationalists*. London.

CLARKE John (1921) *The Spelling of the King's English*. London.

CLAYTON A.S. (Ed) (1960) "John Dewey in Perspective: three papers in honour of John Dewey" in BULLETIN OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, INDIANA UNIVERSITY Vol 36 No 1 January.

COCKBURN Henry (1888) *Circuit Journeys*. Edinburgh.

COLLEGE OF PRECEPTORS (1896) *Fifty Years of Progress in Education: a review of the work of the College of Preceptors 1846-1896*. London.

COLLINS M. & DREVER J. (1926) *Experimental Psychology*. London.

- COLLINS M. & DREVER J. (1926-49) *A First Laboratory Guide to Psychology*. London.
- COLLINS M. & DREVER J. (1936) *Psychology and Practical Life*. London.
- COMBE George (1841) *Notes on the United States of North America during a Phrenological Visit in 1838-9-40*. Edinburgh.
- CONANT J.B. (1963) *The Education of American Teachers*. New York.
- CONGRESS OF THE UNIVERSITIES OF THE EMPIRE (1921) Second Meeting. Report of the Proceedings (ed A. Hill). London.
- CONRAD J. & HUTCHINSON G. (1885) *The German Universities for the Last Fifty Years*. Glasgow.
- COTTLE B. & SHERBORNE J.W. (1959) *The Life of a University* (revised edition). Bristol.
- COUTTS J. (1909) *A History of the University of Glasgow from its Foundation in 1451 to 1909*. Glasgow.
- CRAIGIE J. (1972) *The Scottish Council for Research in Education 1928-72*. Edinburgh.
- CRAIGIE J. (1974) *A Bibliography of Scottish Education 1872-1972*. London.
- CREMIN L.A. (1962) *The Transformation of the School: progressivism in American education 1876-1957*.
- CREMIN L.A. (1965) *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley: an essay on the historiography of American education*. New York.
- CRUICKSHANK M. (1970) *A History of the Training of Teachers in Scotland*. London.
- CUNNINGHAM K.S. (1934) *Educational Observations and Reflections*. Melbourne.
- CURR William (1969) "A Review of the Summerfield Report" in the BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY Vol 39 Part 1 February.

DAICHES D. (Ed) (1964) *The Idea of a New University: an Experiment in Sussex* London.

DARROCH Alexander (1903a) *Education as a University Subject*. inaugural lecture delivered to the University of Edinburgh, October 1903. Edinburgh.

DARROCH Alexander (1903b) *Herbart and the Herbartian Theory of Education: a criticism*. London.

DARROCH Alexander (1906) *The Place and Function of the Scottish Universities in our Educational System*. Edinburgh.

DARROCH Alexander (1907) *The Children: some educational problems*. London.

DARROCH Alexander (1911) *The Place of Psychology in the Training of the Teacher*. London.

DAVIE George Elder (1961) *The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and her Universities in the nineteenth century*. Edinburgh.

DAVIE George Elder (1985) *Scottish Philosophy and Specialization: a long view*. Royal Society of Edinburgh, Occasional Papers Nos 2-6.

DAVIE George Elder (1973) *The Social Significance of the Scottish Philosophy of Common Sense* the Dow Lecture, University of Dundee, November 1972. Dundee.

DAVIES Emily (1896) *Women in the Universities of England and Scotland*. Cambridge.

DELAMONT Sara (1984a) "The Old Girl Network: reflections on the fieldwork at St. Luke's" in BURGESS *The Research Process in Educational Settings: ten case studies*

DELAMONT Sara (1984b) "Lessons from St. Luke's: reflections on a study of Scottish classroom life" in DOCKRELL W.B. *An Attitude of Mind*.

- DELL Geoffrey (1969) "Thirty Years of Child Guidance: the development of the Glasgow Child Guidance Service" in SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol 1 No 3 June.
- DENT H.C. (1962) *The Training of Teachers in the United Kingdom* London.
- DENT H.C. (1970) *1870-1970, A Century of Growth in English Education* London.
- DOBINSON C.H. (Ed) (1951) *Education in a Changing World: a symposium* Oxford.
- DOCKRELL W.B. (1984) *An Attitude of Mind: twenty five years of educational research in Scotland* Edinburgh.
- DODD Catherine I. (1901) *Introduction to the Herbartian Principles of Teaching* London.
- DONALDSON James (1874) *Lectures on the History of Education in Prussia and England and on Kindred Topics* Edinburgh.
- DONALDSON James (1886) Address delivered at the Opening of the Session 1886-7 of the United College, St. Andrews.
- DONALDSON James (1904) *The Reconstruction of the Arts Course*: address on the opening of session 1904-05, St. Andrews.
- DREVER James (1912) *Greek Education, Its Practice and Principles* Cambridge.
- DREVER James (1922) *An Introduction to the Psychology of Education* London.
- DREVER James (1921) *The Psychology of Everyday Life* London.
- DREVER James (1948) "An Autobiography" in OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY No 1 January.
- DREVER James & DRUMMOND Margaret (1929) *The Psychology of the Pre-School Child* London.
- ELVIN H.L. (1963) "The Robbins Report and the Education and Training of Teachers" in

EDUCATION FOR TEACHING No 62 November.

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA (11th edition) Cambridge.

FARNSWORTH P.R., McNEMAR R.O. & McNEMAR Q. (1962) *Annual Review of Psychology*. Palo Alto.

FINDLAY I.R. (1979) *Sir John Struthers K.C.B., Secretary of the Scotch/Scottish Education Department 1904-1922* (unpublished PhD thesis, Dundee University).

FINDLAY J.J. (1889) *Teaching as a Career for University Men*. London.

FINDLAY J.J. (1903) *The Training of Teachers*: an inaugural lecture delivered at the opening of the Department of Education in the Victoria University of Manchester, October 1903. London.

FINDLAY J.J. (Ed) (1910) *Educational Essays by John Dewey*. London.

FITCH J.G. (1876) "The Universities and the Training of Teachers" in CONTEMPORARY REVIEW Vol XXIX December.

FITCH J.G. (1881) *Lectures on Teaching* delivered in the University of Cambridge during the Lent term 1880. Cambridge.

FITCH J.G. (1890) *Notes on American Schools and Training Colleges*. London.

FLATELY *et al.* (1921) "The Concept of Behaviour: a symposium" from the Proceedings of the University of Durham Philosophical Society Vol VI Pt 2.

FLEMING C.M. (1933) *The Kelvin Measurement of Mental Ability*. Glasgow.

FORD Boris (1964) "The School of Education and Social Work" in DAICHES (Ed) *The Idea of a New University: an Experiment in Sussex*

FOULKES George (Ed) (1964) *Eighty Years On: a chronicle of student activity in the*

University of Edinburgh during the eighty years of the existence of the Students Representative Council. Edinburgh.

FREEMAN F.N. (1926-39) *Mental Tests: their history, principles and applications* (two editions used). Boston.

GATHORNE-HARDY Jonathan (1977) *The Public School Phenomenon 597-1977.* London.

GIBSON W.J. (1912) *Education in Scotland: a sketch of the past and the present* London.

GLADSTONE W.E. (1879) Inaugural Address to the Students of the University of Glasgow, December 5th 1879. London.

GLASGOW William (1875) *The Training of Teachers.* a paper read before the Ayrshire branch of the Educational Institute and at the Educational Congress in the Corporation Galleries, Glasgow in December 1874. Glasgow.

GLOVER T.R. (1943) *Cambridge Retrospect* Cambridge.

GOODENOUGH Florence (1949) *Mental Testing: its history, principles and applications.* New York.

GORDON Peter (Ed) (1980) *The Study of Education: a collection of inaugural lectures Vol I Early and Modern* London.

GOSDEN P.H.J.H. (1972) *The Evolution of a Profession: a study of the contribution of teachers' associations to the development of school teaching as a professional occupation.* Oxford.

GRAHAM Norman W. (1965) "The Administration of Education in Scotland" in PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION Vol 43 Autumn.

La GRANDE ENCYCLOPEDIE (edition of 1887-1902) Paris.

GRANT Alexander (1884) *The Story of the University of Edinburgh during its First Three Hundred Years* London.

GRAY J.L. (1936) *The Nation's Intelligence* London.

GUNN John (1921) *Maurice Paterson, Rector of Moray House: a memorial biography*. London.

HALDANE R.B. (1902) *Education and Empire: addresses on certain topics of the day*. London.

HAMILTON D. (1982) *The Normal Curve and Some of Its Abnormalities* in unpublished typescript.

HAMILTON David (1985a) "Bread and Circuses: some challenges to educational research in the 1980s" in BRITISH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL Vol II No 1.

HAMILTON David (1985b) "Progressivism Reconsidered" in HISTORY WORKSHOP JOURNAL Issue 20 Autumn.

HAMLEY H.R. (Ed) (1935) *The Testing of Intelligence* London.

HAMLEY H.R. *et al.* (1937) *The Educational Guidance of the School Child* London.

HANHAM J.J. (1969) *Scottish Nationalism* London.

HARTOG Philip (1937) *A Conspectus of Examinations in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, being part of the International Institute Examinations Enquiry*. London.

HARVARD COMMITTEE (1966) *The Graduate Study of Education* Cambridge, Massachusetts.

HARVIE C. (1981) *No Gods and Precious Few Heroes* London.

- HAYWARD F.H. (1903) *The Critics of Herbartianism and other Matter Contributory to the Study of the Herbartian Question*. London.
- HAYWARD F.H. (1905) *Three Historical Educators: Pestalozzi, Froebel and Herbart: a lecture delivered at Torquay*. London.
- HAYWARD F.H. (1912) *Educational Administration and Criticism: a sequel to the Holmes Circular*. London.
- HEARNshaw L.S. (1964) *A Short History of British Psychology 1840-1940*. London.
- HEARNshaw L.S. (1979) *Cyril Burt, Psychologist*. London.
- HENDY F.J.R. (1920) *The Universities and the Training of Teachers*. an inaugural lecture delivered in the Hall of Queen's College on October 22nd 1919. Oxford.
- HERRNSTEIN C.J. & BORING E.G. (1965) *A Source Book in the History of Psychology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- HETHERINGTON Hector (1953) *The Social Function of the University*. London.
- HINSDALE B.A. (1900) "The Study of Education in American Colleges and Universities" in EDUCATIONAL REVIEW (New York) February.
- HITLER A. (1933) *Mein Kampf*. Munich.
- HOFSTADTER R. & HARDY C. de W. (1952) *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States*. New York.
- HORN D.B. (1967) *A Short History of the University of Edinburgh 1556-1889*. Edinburgh.
- HUDSON Liam (1977) "Picking Winners: a case study in the recruitment of research students" in NEW UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY Vol 32 No 1 Winter 1977/78.
- HUGHES James L. & KLEMM L.R. (1904) *Progress of Education in the Century*. Toronto.

- HUMES W. (1980) "Alexander Bain and the Development of Educational Theory" in SMITH & HAMILTON *The Meritocratic Intellect*
- HUMES W. & PATERSON H.M. (1983) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980*. Edinburgh.
- HUMES W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*. Edinburgh.
- HUNTER S.L. (1968) *The Scottish Educational System*. Oxford.
- IISALO Taimo (1979) trans. LANDON A. *The Science of Education in Finland 1828-1918* Helsinki.
- IMPERIAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE (1923) Report.
- JARAUSCH K.H. (1983) *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860-1930*. Chicago.
- JOHANNINGMEIER E.V. (1980) "American Educational Research: applications and misapplications of psychology to education" in SMITH & HAMILTON *The Meritocratic Intellect*
- JOLLY William (1873) "The Professional Training of Teachers" in FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW (New Series) Vol XVI.
- JOLLY William (Ed) (1879) *Education: its principles and practice as developed by George Comba* London.
- JONES H. (1923) *Old Memories* London.
- JONES Lance G.E. (1924) *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales: a critical survey*. London.
- JUDD C.H. (1914) "The Training of Teachers in England, Scotland and Germany" in the UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION BULLETIN No 35.

JUDD C.H. (1918) *Introduction to the Scientific Study of Education*. Boston.

JUDD C.H. (1938) *Preparation of School Personnel*. New York.

KANDEL I.L. (1933) *The Outlook in Education*. one of the Joseph Payne Lectures for 1932-33, delivered in the University of London Institute of Education. London.

KANDEL I.L. (1949) "University Departments of Education" in UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY Vol 3 No 3 May.

KEIR G. (1952) "A History of Child Guidance", Pt III of Symposium on Psychologists and Psychiatrists in the Child Guidance Service. BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY Vol XXII Pt I February.

KELLAGHAN T. (1982) "The Effects of Educational Testing" in BULLETIN OF THE NORTHERN IRELAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH No 16 January.

KENNEDY Alexander (1936-44) *The Teacher in the Making* (two editions). Edinburgh.

KERR John (1911) *Memories Grave and Gay*. London.

KERR John (1913) *Scottish Education: school and university from early times to 1908, with addendum 1908-13*. Cambridge.

KNIGHT James (1902) "The Training of Teachers in Scotland: PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF GLASGOW Vol XXXIII.

KNIGHT Rex (1951) "The Scientific Background to Educational Change" in DOBINSON (Ed) *Education in a Changing World*.

KNIGHT William (1887) *The Higher Education of Women with Special Reference to the St. Andrews University LLA Title and Diploma*. being a lecture delivered in the University College of Leeds, Liverpool, Bristol etc. Edinburgh.

KNIGHT William (1888) *Principal Shairp and his Friends*. London.

KNOX H.M. (1950a) "The University of St. Andrews" in UNIVERSITIES REVIEW Vol 22 No 22.

KNOX H.M. (1950b) "The Chair of Education in the University of St. Andrews" in ALUMNUS CHRONICLE (St. Andrews) No 33 January.

KNOX H.M. (1953a) *Two Hundred and Fifty Years of Scottish Education 1696-1946*. Edinburgh.

KNOX H.M. (1953b) "Teacher Training in Northern Ireland" in BULLETIN OF EDUCATION No 31 May.

KNOX H.M. (1962) "Simon Somerville Laurie 1829-1909" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol X No 2.

LALOR John *et al.* (1839) *The Educator: Prize Essays on the Expediency and Means of Elevating the Profession of the Educator in Society*. London.

LARSON M.S. (1977) *The Rise of Professionalism: a sociological analysis*. Berkeley.

LASCH Christopher (1965) *The New Radicalism in America 1889-1963: the Intellectual as a Social Type*. New York.

LAURIE A.P. (1912-22) *The Teacher's Encyclopaedia* (two editions). London.

LAURIE A.P. (1939) *The Case for Germany: a study of modern Germany*. Berlin.

LAURIE S.S. (1881) *On the Educational Wants of Scotland*. introductory lecture of the 1881 session. Edinburgh.

LAURIE S.S. (1883) *Handbook to Lectures on the Theory, Art and History of Education* (3rd edition).

LAURIE S.S. (1884) *John Amos Comenius*. Cambridge.

- LAURIE S.S. (1888) *Occasional Addresses on Educational Subjects* Cambridge.
- LAURIE S.S. (1892) *Teachers Guild Addresses and the Registration of Teachers* London.
- LAURIE S.S. (1899) *The Scottish Code of 1899 and Other Matters* introductory lecture of the 1899 session. Edinburgh.
- LAURIE S.S. (1899) *Institutes of Education* (2nd edition). Edinburgh.
- LAURIE S.S. (1901) *The Training of Teachers and Methods of Instruction* Cambridge.
- LAURIE S.S. (1903a) *Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method in the School* (4th edition). Edinburgh.
- LAURIE S.S. (1903b) *The Code of 1903 and Freedom in Education* delivered to the Edinburgh Branch of the Educational Institute. Edinburgh.
- LAURIE S.S. (1904) Dick Bequest Trust. General Report to the Governors, 1890–1904. Edinburgh.
- LEE J. (1939) *Tomorrow is a New Day*. London.
- LEE J. (1963) *This Great Journey: a volume of autobiography 1904–45* London.
- LENMAN B. & STOCKS J. (1972) "The Beginnings of State Education in Scotland 1872–1885" in *Scottish Educational Studies* Vol 4 No 2 November.
- LILLEY A.L. (1906) *Sir Joshua Fitch: an account of his life and work* London.
- LINDROTH Sten (1976–*sic*) *A History of Uppsala University 1477–1977*. Stockholm.
- LUMSDEN Louisa (1911) "The University Education of Women at St. Andrews" in VOTIVA TABELLA: a memorial volume of St. Andrews University in connection with its Quincentenary Festival.
- LUNDGREEN P. (1983) "Differentiation in German Higher Education" in JARAUSCH, *The*

Transformation of Higher Learning

McCALLUM Catherine M. (1952) "Child Guidance in Scotland" – Part IV of a symposium on Psychologists and Psychiatrists in the Child Guidance Service in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY Vol XXII Part 2.

McCLELLAND C.E. (1980) *State, Society and University in Germany 1700–1914*. Cambridge.

McCLELLAND J.C. (1983) "Diversification in Russian Soviet Education" in JARAUSCH, *The Transformation of Higher Learning*

McCLELLAND W. (1942) *Selection for Secondary Education*. London.

McDIARMID H. (1926) *A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle*. Edinburgh.

McDOWELL R.B. & WEBB D.A. (1982) Trinity College, Dublin 1592–1952. Cambridge.

McINTOSH Douglas M. (1959) *Educational Guidance and the Pool of Ability*. London.

McINTOSH Douglas M. (1962) "The Value of Educational Research" in UNICORN REVIEW Vol I No 1.

McINTYRE D. & MORRISON A. (1967) "The Educational Opinions of Teachers in Training" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF SOCIAL AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY 6th February.

MACKENZIE Donald A. (1981) *Statistics in Britain 1865–1930: the social construction of scientific knowledge*. Edinburgh.

MACKIE J.D. (1954) *The University of Glasgow 1451–1951*. Glasgow.

MACKINTOSH Mary (1962) *Education in Scotland: yesterday and today*. Glasgow.

MACLEAN G.E. (1917) "Studies in Higher Education in England and Scotland: with

suggestions for Universities and Colleges in the United States" in UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION BULLETIN No 16.

MACMURRAY John (1939) *The Boundaries of Science: a study in the philosophy of psychology*. London.

MACMURRAY John (1944) "The Functions of a University" in POLITICAL QUARTERLY Vol XV No 4 October-December.

McPHERSON A. (1973) "Selections and Survivals: a sociology of the ancient Scottish universities" in BROWN, *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change*

McPHERSON A. (1983) "An Angle on the Geist: persistence and change in the Scottish educational tradition" in HUMES & PATERSON, *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*

McPHERSON A. (1984) "An Episode in the Control of Research" in DOCKRELL, *An Attitude of Mind*.

McPHERSON A. (1985) "The Management of Consent in Scottish Education 1885-1985": keynote lecture to the Annual Conference of the Scottish Educational Research Association, reprinted in TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT (SCOTLAND) 11-18 October 1985.

McPHERSON A. & ATHERTON G. (19?) "Graduate Teachers in Scotland: a sociological analysis of recruitment to teaching amongst recent graduates of the four ancient Scottish universities" in SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol 2 No 1.

McPHERSON John A. (1948) *Education and the Challenge of Change* Glasgow.

MACE C.A. & VERNON P.E. (1953) *Current Trends in British Psychology*. London.

MALCOLM Charles & HUNTER J.N.W. (1948) *Moray House: a brief sketch of its history*. Edinburgh.

MALLOCH James (1919) "Teaching as a Profession" in CLARKE (Ed) *Problems of National Education by Twelve Scottish Educationalists* London.

MANNIX & WHELLAN (1847) *History, Gazetteer and Directory of Cumberland*. Beverley.

MANZER R.A. (1970) *Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944*. Manchester.

MARK Thiseltan (1913) *Modern Views on Education* London.

MAXWELL W.S. (1876) Address to the Senatus and General Council of Glasgow University. Glasgow.

MEIKLEJOHN J.M.D. (1881) *An Old Educational Reformer, Dr Andrew Bell*. Edinburgh.

MERCER G. & FORSYTH D.J.C. (1975) "Some Aspects of Recruitment to School Teaching among University Graduates in Scotland 1860-1955" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES xxiii.

MEUMANN E. (1905) *Die Experimentelle Pädagogik* Leipzig.

MILLIGAN James (1889) *Is Teaching a Profession?* inaugural address to the Glasgow branch of the EIS 19th October 1889.

MITCHELL F.W. (1967) *Sir Fred Clarke, Master Teacher 1880-1952* London.

MONROE Paul (1911) *A Cyclopaedia of Education* New York.

MONROE Will S. (1896) *Professional Reading: a classified list of Heath's Pedagogical Library with a course of reading for teachers based upon the same* Boston.

MONROE Will S. (1897) *Bibliography of Education* New York.

MONROE Will S. (1899) *Status of Child Study in Europe* Worcester, Massachusetts.

MOODY T.W. & BECKETT J.C. (1959) *Queen's, Belfast 1845-1949: the history of a university*. London.

MOON Penderel (1973) *Wavell, the Viceroy's Journal*. London.

MORGAN Alexander (1905) "Scottish University Reform" in UNIVERSITY REVIEW Vol II No 10 February.

MORGAN Alexander (1929) *Makers of Scottish Education*. London.

MORGAN Alexander (1927) *Rise and Progress of Scottish Education*. Edinburgh.

MORGAN Alexander (1933) *Scottish University Studies*. London.

MORGAN Alexander (1935) *Two Famous Old Edinburgh Colleges: a century of teacher training*. Edinburgh.

MORGAN C. Lloyd (1894) *Psychology for Teachers*. London.

MORGAN Iwan (Ed) (1928) *The College by the Sea: a record and a review*.
Aberystwyth.

MORGAN J.M. (1833) *Address to the Proprietors of the University of London*. London.

MORRIS Ben (1955) "Educational Research in England and Wales" in INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF EDUCATION Year 1.

MORRIS Ben (1972) *Objectives and Perspectives in Education: studies in educational theory 1955-1970*. London.

MORRISH Ivor (1970) *Education since 1800*. London.

MUNSTERBERG Hugo (1913) *Psychology and Industrial Efficiency*. London.

MUNSTERBERG Hugo (1909) *Psychology and the Teacher*. London.

- MURCHISON Carl (Ed) (1936) *A History of Psychology in Autobiography*. Worcester Massachusetts.
- MURRAY David (1914) *Miss Janet Ann Galloway and the Higher Education of Women in Glasgow*. Glasgow.
- MYERS D. (1983) "Scottish Schoolmasters in the Nineteenth Century: professionalism and politics in HUMES & PATERSON, *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*.
- NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, ENGLAND AND WALES. Report for the period to 31 Mar 1947.
- NEILL A.S. (1936) *Is Scotland Educated?* London.
- NISBET John (1962) "The Scottish Bachelor of Education Degree: a follow-up" in BULLETIN OF THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY No 47 April.
- NISBET John (1969) "The Aberdeen MEd: past, present and future" in EDUCATION IN THE NORTH Vol 6.
- NISBET John (1984) "The Changing Scene" in DOCKRELL *An Attitude of Mind*.
- NISBET John & KIRK Gordon (Eds) (1969) *Scottish Education Looks Ahead*. Edinburgh.
- NISBET Stanley (1966) "A Method for Advanced Seminars" in UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY Vol 20 No 3 June.
- NISBET Stanley (1967) "The Study of Education in Scotland" in SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol 1 No 1 June.
- OGILVIE Joseph (1907) *The Church of Scotland Training College in Aberdeen. Records of the Classes for 1895-96 to 1905-07*. Aberdeen.
- Joseph OGILVIE *and his first twenty-one classes*. Aberdeen.

- OGREN Gustaf (1953) *Trends in English Teachers' Training from 1800: a survey and an investigation*. Stockholm.
- An OLD STUDENT (A.R.) (1869) *Memoir of the late James Pillans LL.D., Professor of Roman Literature in the University of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh.
- OLIVER R.A.C. (1943) *The Training of Teachers in Universities*. London.
- OSBORNE G.S. (1966) *Scottish and English Schools: a comparative survey of the past fifty years*. London.
- OZGA J.T. & LAWN M.A. (1981) *Teachers, Professionalism and Class*. London.
- PASSMORE John (1957) *A Hundred Years of Philosophy*. London.
- PATERSON H.M. (1975) *Godfrey Thomson and the Development of Psychometrics in Scotland*. Unpublished paper read at the 1975 Conference of the British Educational Research Association.
- PAYNE Joseph (1880) *Lectures on the Science and Art of Education with other lectures and essays*. London.
- PAYNE Joseph *et al.* (1872) *Lectures on Education delivered before the College of Preceptors in the year 1871*. London.
- PAYNE William H. (1886) *Contributions to the Science of Education*. New York.
- PEDDIE J.R. (1926) *The Scottish Universities: a record of their development during the period 1826-1926* - unpublished DLitt thesis, Glasgow University.
- PEDDIE J.R. (1951) *The First Fifty Years: the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland*. Edinburgh.
- PILLANS James (1828) *Principles of Elementary Teaching, chiefly in reference to the Parochial Schools of Scotland in two letters to T.F. Kennedy Esq. M.P.*. Edinburgh.

- PILLANS James (1848) *A Word for the Universities of Scotland and a Plea for the Humanity Classes in the College of Edinburgh*. Edinburgh.
- PILLANS James (1854) *Three Lectures on the Proper Objects and Methods of Education in reference to the Different Orders of Society and on the relative Utility of Classical Instruction, delivered in the Humanity Classroom, November 1835*.
Edinburgh.
- PILLANS James (1856) *Contributions to the Cause of Education*. London.
- PILLANS James (1862) *Educational Papers, read before the Education Department of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*. Edinburgh.
- PILLEY John (1957) "The Education of the Technologist" in *UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY* Vol 11 No 2 February.
- PILLEY John (1958) "Teacher Training in Scotland" in *UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY* Vol 12 No 3 May.
- PLAYFAIR L. (1889) *Subjects of Social Welfare*. London.
- POTTER F.F. (1949) *Educational Journey: memories of 50 years in public education*.
London.
- POWELL John P. (1966) *Universities and University Education: a select bibliography*.
Slough.
- QUEEN'S COLLEGE, DUNDEE (1958) *A Handbook*. Dundee.
- QUICK R.H. (1890) *Educational Reformers*. London.
- READER W.J. (1966) *Professional Men: the rise of the professional classes in nineteenth century England*. London.
- REAY Lord (1885) *University Reform in Scotland*. rectorial address, delivered at St.

Andrews, 30th January 1885.

REMACLE Georges (1909) *La Philosophie de S.S. Laurie* Brussels.

RICH R.W. (1933) *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge.

RICHARDSON C.A. (1922) *Methods and Experiments in Mental Tests* London.

ROBERTSON James (1964) *Godfrey Thomson* Edinburgh.

RODGER A.G. (1936) "The Application of Six Group Intelligence Tests to the Same Children and the Effects of Practice" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY Vol VII Part 3 November.

ROMAN Frederick William (1930) *The New Education in Europe* London.

ROSCOE F. (1917) "Teaching as a Profession" in BENSON, *Cambridge Essays on Education*.

ROSS D. (1883) *Education as a University Subject: its history, present position and prospects* Glasgow.

RUDD C.E. & SIMPSON R. (1975) *The Highest Education: a study of graduate education in Britain* London.

RUGG Harold (1947) *Foundations for American Education* Yonkers.

RUGG Harold (1952) *The Teacher of Teachers: frontiers of theory and practice in teacher education* New York.

RUSK R.R. (1912) *Introduction to Experimental Education* London.

RUSK R.R. (1918-54) *The Doctrines of the Great Educators* London.

RUSK R.R. (1919) *Experimental Education* London.

RUSK R.R. (1928a) *The Philosophical Bases of Education* London.

RUSK R.R. (1928b) *The Training of Teachers in Scotland* Edinburgh.

RUSK R.R. (1932) *Research in Education: an introduction* London.

RUSK R.R. (1960) *An Outline of Experimental Education* London.

RUSK R.R. (1961) "Sir John Adams 1857-1934" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol X.

SADLER Michael (1935) *John Adams: a lecture in his memory* (Second John Adams Lecture at University of London Institute of Education). London.

SAMPSON Olive (1980) *Child Guidance: its history, provenance and future* London.

SANDIFORD Peter (1928) *Educational Psychology: an objective study* London.

SCHONELL F.J. (1947-49) "The Development of Educational Research in Great Britain" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY November 1947 ff.

SCOTLAND James (1969a) *The History of Scottish Education* London.

SCOTLAND James (1969b) "Teacher Training" in NISBET & KIRK *Scottish Education Looks Ahead* Edinburgh.

SCOTLAND James (1969c) "T.C: a history of Aberdeen College of Education" - supplement to EDUCATION IN THE NORTH Vol VI.

SCOTLAND James (1975) "Battles Long Ago: Aberdeen University and the training of teachers 1907-08" in SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol 7 No 2 November.

SCOTTISH ASSOCIATION FOR MENTAL HYGIENE (1942) *Report on Developments of Child Guidance in the West of Scotland during the War Period* Glasgow.

SCOTTISH COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (1949) *Aids to Educational*

Research: comprising bibliographies and plans of research. London.

SCOTTISH EDUCATION REFORM COMMITTEE (1917) *Reform in Scottish Education*
Edinburgh.

SELLECK R.J.W. (1968) *The New Education 1870-1914* London.

SEMEONOFF B. (1969) "Changing Horizons: an essay in autobiography in BULLETIN OF
THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY Vol 22 No 76 July.

SETH George (1968) "Dissonance and Stress in the Teaching of Psychology: some
reflections of an accidental psychologist" in BULLETIN OF BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL
SOCIETY 21.

SHACKLOCK-EVANS E.G. (1963) "Research in Education" in EDUCATION FOR TEACHING
No 60 February.

SHAFE M. (1982) *University Education in Dundee 1881-1981*. Dundee.

SHARP S.A. (1980) "Godfrey Thomson and the Concept of Intelligence" in SMITH &
HAMILTON *The Meritocratic Intellect*

SHAW G.B. (1903) *Maxims for Revolutionists* appendix to *Man and Superman* London.

SHAW K.E. (1963) "Training College Staffing 1954-1961" in EDUCATION FOR TEACHING
No 61 May.

SILVER Harold & TEAGUE S. John (1970) *The History of British Universities 1800-1969,*
excluding Oxford and Cambridge: a bibliography. London.

SIMON B. (1971) *Intelligence, Psychology and Education: a Marxist critique* London.

SIMPSON J.H. (1954) *Schoolmaster's Harvest* London.

SIMPSON James (1836) *The Philosophy of Education with its Practical Application to a*

System and Plan of Popular Education as a National Object Edinburgh.

SIMPSON Renate (1983) *How the Ph.D. Came to Britain: a century of struggle for postgraduate education*. Guildford.

SIMPSON W.D. (1963) *The Fusion of 1860: a record of the centenary celebrations and a history of the University of Aberdeen 1860-1960*. Edinburgh.

SKINNER A.F. (1953) "Professional Education" in YEAR BOOK OF EDUCATION. London.

SKINNER R.T. (1929) *Yesterday and Today*. Edinburgh.

SMITH Frank (1923) *The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth*. London.

SMITH John (1913) *Broken Links in Scottish Education*. London.

SMITH J.V. & HAMILTON D. (Eds) (1980) *The Meritocratic Intellect: studies in the history of educational research*. Aberdeen.

SOUTHEY R. & C.C. (1844) *The Life of Dr Andrew Bell*. London.

SPENCER Herbert (1864) *Education: intellectual, moral and physical*. New York.

STEWART George (1927) *The Story of Scottish Education*. London.

STEWART W.A. Campbell (1950) "Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology in the Training of Teachers" in SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW Vol XLII Section 1.

STEWART W.A.C. & McCANN W.P. (1967) *The Educational Innovators*. London.

STINNETT T.M. & HUGGETT A.V. (1956) *Professional Problems of Teachers*. New York.

STOCKS J. (1986) "Broken Links in Scottish Teacher Training" in SCOTTISH EDUCATIONAL REVIEW Vol 18 No 2.

STONE Lawrence (Ed) (1976) *Schooling and Society: studies in the history of*

education Baltimore.

STORR F. (1899) *Life and Remains of the Revd. R.H. Quick* Cambridge.

STORR Richard J. (1953) *The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America* Chicago.

STRONG John (1909) *A History of Secondary Education in Scotland: an account of Scottish secondary education from early times to the Education Act of 1908* Oxford.

STRUTHERS John (1875) *On University Improvement* an address delivered to the students in Arts of Aberdeen University on opening the session of the University Debating Society, 12th November 1875.

SUTHERLAND Gillian (1977) "The Magic of Measurement: mental testing and English education 1900-1940" in *TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY*.

SUTHERLAND Gillian (1984) *Ability, Merit and Measurement: mental testing and English education 1880-1940*. Oxford.

SUTHERLAND Gillian & SHARP Stephen (1980) "The first official psychologist in the world: aspects of the professionalization of psychology in early twentieth century Britain" in *HISTORY OF SCIENCE* xviii.

TAYLOR William (1964) "The Organisation of Educational Studies" in *EDUCATION FOR TEACHING* No 65 November.

TAYLOR William (1965) "Who Teaches Education?" in *UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY* Vol 20 No 1 December.

THOMAS J.B. (1978) "The Day Training College: a Victorian innovation in teacher training" in *BRITISH JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION* Vol 4 No 3.

THOMAS J.B. (1979) "The Curriculum of a Day-Training College: the logbooks of

J.W. Anderson" in JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND HISTORY.

THOMAS J.B. (1983) "The Beginnings of Teacher Training in University College, Bangor" in TRANSACTIONS OF THE CAERNARVONSHIRE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

THOMSON Godfrey (1924) *How to Calculate Correlations: a non-mathematical book of instructions* London.

THOMSON Godfrey (1924) *A Modern Philosophy of Education* London.

THOMSON Godfrey (1931) "The Use of Tests of Intelligence in English and Scottish Schools" in INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION REVIEW Vol III.

THOMSON Godfrey (1969) *The Education of an Englishman: an autobiography*. Edinburgh.

THORNDIKE Edward L. (1929) "Memoir of Granville Stanley Hall" in U.S. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES MEMOIRS Vol XII (Fifth Memoir). Washington.

THORNDIKE Edward L. *et al.* (1927) *The Measurement of Intelligence* New York.

TIBBLE J.W. (Ed) (1966) *The Study of Education* London.

TOMLINSON Leila (1968) "Oxford University and the Training of Teachers: the early years (1892-1921)" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES Vol XVI No 3 October.

TORRANCE Harry (1981) "The Origins and Development of Mental Testing in England and the United States" in BRITISH JOURNAL OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION Vol 2 No 1.

TRAINING OF TEACHERS JOINT COMMITTEE (1897) Summary Report Proceedings prepared for the Council or Committees of the Various Societies of Secondary Teachers which have been represented on this Committee. London.

- TROPP Asher (1957) *The School Teachers: the growth of the teaching profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the present day*. London.
- TYSON J.C. and TUCK J.P. (1971) *The Origins and Development of the Training of Teachers in the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DUNDEE (1883) *The Opening Ceremony, Professor Stuart's Inaugural Address and Description of the College Buildings*. Dundee.
- UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN (1906) *Quatercentenary Celebrations handbook to the city and university*. Aberdeen.
- VALENTINE C.W. (1914-39) *Introduction to Experimental Psychology in Relation to Education*. London.
- VAN DER EYKEN Willem & TURNER Barry (1970) *Adventures in Education*. Harmondsworth.
- VAUGHAN J.E. & ARGLES M. (1969) *British Government Publications Concerning Education: an introductory guide*. Liverpool.
- VERNON P.E. (1950) *Modern Educational Psychology as a Science*. London.
- VERNON P.E. (ed) (1957) *Secondary School Selection: a British Psychological Inquiry*. London.
- VERNON P.E. (1961) "The Contribution to Education of Sir Godfrey Thomson" in *BRITISH JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES* Vol X.
- VERNON P.E. (1979) *Intelligence Testing 1928-78: a paper presented on the occasion of his being awarded the fellowship of SCRE* Edinburgh.
- VOLLMER H.M. & MILLS D.L. (1966). *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs.
- VOTIVA TABELLA (1911) A memorial volume of St. Andrews University in connection

with its Quincentenary Festival.

WADE Newman A. (1939) *Post-Primary Education in the Primary Schools of Scotland 1872-1936*. London.

WAKE R. (1984) *Events Antecedent to the Founding of the Scottish Council for Research in Education*. unpublished MEd thesis, Edinburgh University.

WALKER D.A. (1967) *The Role of Educational Research in Educational Change* paper given in the UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg, July 1967 (unpublished).

WALKER J.H. (1970) *The Ad Hoc Administration of Education in Scotland 1872-1929*. unpublished PhD thesis, Glasgow University.

WALL W.D. (Ed) (1956) *Psychological Services for Schools*. Hamburg.

WALL W.D. & HUSEN T. (1968) *Educational Research and Policy Making*. Slough.

WALTON J. & KUETHE J.L. (Ed) (1963) *The Disciplines of Education*. Madison, Wisconsin.

WARBURTON F.W. (1962) "Educational Psychology" in FARNSWORTH *et al.* *Annual Review of Psychology*.

WATSON Foster (Ed) (1922) *The Encyclopaedia and Dictionary of Education*. London.

WELSH B.W. (1939) *After the Dawn: a record of the pioneer work in Edinburgh for the higher education of women*. Edinburgh.

WESLEY Edgar B. (1957) *NEA, the First Hundred Years: the building of the teaching profession*. New York.

WILENSKY Harold L. (1964) "The Professionalization of Everyone?" in AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY Vol LXX No 2 September.

WILLEY F.T. & MADDISON R.E. (1971) *An Enquiry into Teacher Training*. London.

WILSON J.D. (1967) "The Junior Student System" Sect 4 of BONE (Ed) *Studies in the History of Scottish Education 1872-1939*.

WINCH W.H. (1909) "A Modern Basis for Educational Theory" in MIND Vol XVIII.

WOOD A.C. (1953) *A History of the University College, Nottingham 1881-1948* Oxford.

WOOD H.P. (1964) "Teacher Training in England and Scotland" in ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE Vol XX No 88 March.

WOOTTON Barbara (1952) "Reflections of Resigning a Professorship" in UNIVERSITIES QUARTERLY November.

WRIGHT G.G.N. (1963) Note on Kennedy-Fraser in BULLETIN OF THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY Vol 16 No 50.

WRIGHT J.N. & SNODGRASS N.S. (1942) *Scotland and Its People: a symposium* Edinburgh.

YOUNG Michael (1965) *Innovation and Research in Education* London.

ZILVERSMIT (1976) "The Failure of Progressive Education 1920-1940" in STONE *Schooling and Society*.

ZINCKE F.B. (1876) Inaugural address, delivered in the Theatre of the Society of Arts, 8th November 1876 at the first general meeting of the Society for the Development of the Science of Education. London.